Theological Magazine

of the

Evangelical Synod of North America.

Published by the Evangelical Synod of North America. Price per year (six numbers) $2.00; to foreign countries, $2.20. Rev. H. Kamphausen, Dr. theol. (Giessen Univ.), 1956 W. Boulevard, Cleveland, Ohio, Editor.

All communications relating to editorial work, all contributions and exchanges must be addressed to the editor.

All communications relating to business matters must be addressed to Eden Publishing House, 1712-24 Chouteau Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

Volume 61 St. Louis, Mo. January 1, 1933

THE GENIUS OF THE REFORMED CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES IN THE LIGHT OF ITS HISTORY

George W. Richards

(President of the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church at Lancaster, Pa.)

It is appropriate at this time, when a Plan of Union is before the Evangelical Synod of North America and the Reformed Church in the United States, that we consider the genius of the two Churches. There are those, and perhaps they are in the majority, who care little for what these Churches have been centuries ago; they want to know what is their spirit and life at present. That, of course, is the primary question, when we come to consider the practicability of uniting the two Churches.

Yet there are those, also, who will be able to understand the relation of the two Churches now a little better in the light of their origin and history. At the request of the Editor of the *Theological Magazine,* and with the limitations of space he allowed me, I shall write briefly on the genius of the Reformed Church as one discerns it in her beginning and her growth.

In its origin the German Reformed Church in the United States goes back, in a sense, to Ulric Zwingli; but as a part of the Reformed Church in Germany it had its beginning in the Palatinate and the Rhine lands. In the time of Frederick the Pious, about 1560, a distinctive form of German Reformed Protestantism developed and found its doctrinal expression in the *Heidelberg Cate-*

chism, 1563, both a confession and a catechism, and to this day the only doctrinal standard of the Reformed Church in the United States. A book of worship was published in the same year, 1563, known as the *Palatinate Liturgy.* The church with a new catechism and a new liturgy required, also, a new organization. This need was met by the publication of the *Kirchenrathsordnung,* 1564. It was prepared by Christopher Ehem and is considered the first example of a consistorial organization in the Reformed Church as a whole.

I

In its government the German Reformed Church was controlled at first not by the congregational presbytery and the Classis as we now have them; but by the Consistory which was composed, as in the Lutheran Church, of six persons, three theologians and three lawyers who were appointed by the Prince, and not elected by the congregation. Each district, with a number of congregations, was under the supervision of an inspector or superintendent. Each superintendent was appointed by the General Consistory, whose place today is taken, in the Reformed Church in the United States, by the General Synod. But the General Consistory was appointed by the Elector or Prince to have oversight of all the churches in all the districts of the whole province or realm. In its organization the German Reformed Church was far more Lutheran than Reformed or Calvinistic.

After 1580 modifications were made in the *Kirchenrathsordnung* of 1564, so as to make room for the following judicatories and officers: (1) The Presbytery (our Consistory), with the pastor as president, charged with the oversight of the internal and external affairs of the congregation and the exercise of discipline including the right of excommunication; (2) the *Kirchenrath,* located at Heidelberg, having the general superintendency of all the churches and controlled by the Elector; (3) the district superintendents or inspectors, who mediated between the congregational presbyteries and the *Kirchenrath* and may be called the assistants of the latter; (4) the District and the General Synod. Even so, the government was far from being purely Calvinistic or presbyterial. It was a blend of the German consistorial and the Genevan presbyterial church polity.

II

The distinctive genius of the Reformed Church in the United States is seen in the Heidelberg Catechism. Of this, therefore, I shall write at some length.

The Heidelberg has one hundred and twenty-nine questions and answers. Its purpose, as defined in the *Vorrede* of the first

edition, is not only the instruction of the youth in the churches and schools in Christian doctrine, but also to furnish the preachers and teachers a certain fixed form and standard by which they may be guided in teaching the young, and not follow their changeable fancies or introduce objectionable doctrine.

There is a marked improvement on the Genevan catechism in the form of the questions and answers. They are simpler, briefer, more rhythmical and compact. The catechumen is addressed directly in the second person, "thy," "thee." The answers are given in the first person, "I," or "we." Contrast this method with that of Calvin and you will find that the Heidelberg is conceived from a different point of view, has a different method of imparting religious truth, and regards the catechumen as occupying a different position in the Kingdom of Grace. The appeal is made to his personal experience in Christ Jesus, which is the product of perennial fellowship with Him in His Church from childhood. Under the guidance of the minister this experience comes to fruition and finds appropriate expression in the language of the catechism. The youth, therefore, is not discussing theological problems with his instructor, nor is he taking a course in theology, all of which at the proper time is legitimate; but according to the catechism he now relates the great facts of Christian revelation, as he has comprehended them by faith, to his personal salvation. From them he draws comfort, assurance, inspiration, strength, hope, and guidance.

Observe the threefold division of the Heidelberg, summarized in Ques. 2: "How many things are necessary for thee to know, that thou in this comfort mayest live and die happily?" Ans. "Three things: First, the greatness of my sin and misery. Second, how I am redeemed from all my sins and misery. Third, how I am to be thankful to God for such redemption"—sin, salvation, thanksgiving. The outline follows the divisions of the Epistle to the Romans. It reproduces the historical order of Christian experience in every age, and is soteriological rather than theological. Thus the parts of the catechism are genetically related, bound together by the logic of life. Its contents cannot be comprehended by an intellectual process, nor be taught as abstract propositions. The whole scheme of the book is experimental and confessional. "It is a representation," says Dr. Nevin, "rather of the great facts of religion in their own living and concrete form, so ordered as to address itself continually to the believing contemplation of heart and soul."

The Heidelberg is much more reserved on the doctrine of the decrees than Calvin, which is especially remarkable because both its authors, Olevianus and Ursinus, were Calvinists. The following

questions are said to teach election and to contain predestinarian doctrine. Ques. 27: Providence is defined to be "the Almighty and everywhere present power of God whereby as it were by His hands He still upholds heaven and earth, with all creatures, and so governs them that . . . all things come not by chance but by His fatherly hand." Ques. 31, in explanation of the name of Christ, says: "He is ordained of God the Father and anointed with the Holy Ghost to be our chief prophet," etc. Ques. 52, relating to the second advent of Christ, says: "He will take me with all His chosen ones *(cum omnibus electis)* to Himself unto heavenly joy and glory." Ques. 54 says: "Out of the whole human race from the beginning to the end of the world the Son of God, by His Word and Spirit, gathers, defends and preserves for Himself unto everlasting life, a chosen communion *(coetum ad vitam aeternam electum)*, and that I am and forever shall remain a living member of the same."

These statements are far less positive in reference to predestination than those in the Genevan catechism. In fact all who have studied the Heidelberg have claimed to find in it the Calvinistic doctrine of election only by implication and inference. No one could deny that it teaches the sovereignty of God in realizing the eternal purpose of His creation; but not by an arbitrary decree which overrides the freedom of the creature and destroys human responsibility. In the doctrine of sovereign grace the catechism is in agreement not only with Calvin but with the Bible and with all Protestantism. There is, however, a wide difference between the sovereignty of God, which is a religious truth that all Christians accept, and the speculative inference of the *decretum horribile*. The doctrine of a double predestination is a philosophical deduction to account for the fact that the gospel is accepted by some and rejected by others; it is not an original idea of faith necessary to religious life. It is significant, indeed, that it is not found in the first edition of the "Institutes."

By a comparative view of the general scheme of the catechism, perhaps as much as by detailed analysis, its peculiar doctrinal positions must be understood. In general it is Calvinistic and not Arminian. The Augustinian doctrine of sin and grace is held over against Pelagianism. The depravity and helplessness of the race through the fall are clearly affirmed. Neither the race nor the individual has ability to recover itself from this lost condition. The fall is traced to a concrete historical fact—the disobedience of our first parents. It is generic, involving all men; not, as in the Pelagian view, merely the individual. The origin of sin is not referred to a metaphysical mystery beyond the scope of historical revelation but to a definite act of man.

Man's salvation is attributed absolutely to the free and unmerited grace of God in Jesus Christ. The starting point is not in the divine sovereignty or in the eternal abstract will of God as metaphysically apprehended, but in Jesus Christ. He freely offers Himself a propitiatory sacrifice for all men. The catechism steers clear of synergism and Arminianism. It does not limit the atonement to the elect. As the fall is organic so is redemption. Yet the redemption wrought out by Christ inures to the salvation only of those who are born again and are made partakers of His life by the Holy Ghost. The subjective condition by which men become partakers of Christian redemption is faith. This involves not only assent to a doctrine or belief in a decree, but "a living apprehension of the whole perennial fact of Christianity as embodied in the Apostles' Creed." Faith itself is not a product of the human will but of the Holy Ghost who "works it in our hearts by the preaching of the Gospel and confirms it by the use of the sacraments." We find here, then, the substantial and positive elements of the Calvinistic system, at least under some of its aspects; but the subject is treated rather Christologically, and the metaphysical questions pertaining to the sovereignty of God in relation to the human will are not brought forth.

The most recent critical analysis and comparative estimate of the catechism has been made by A. Lang in a work entitled, *"Der Heid. Katechismus und vier verwandte Katechismen,"* 1907. In the last pages of the Introduction he assigns the catechism its proper place in Protestantism. It is, he says, the rich, ripe product not only of Calvinism, but of influences which came from all the earlier Reformed catechisms, as well as from those of the German Lutheran Reformation. The Heidelberg is simplified, clarified, and made more practical. In it the religious and the ethical elements are separated from the theological, in spite of certain oversights, far more sharply than in any preceding catechism. It speaks to the heart more directly and reaches into life far more practically than either Calvin's or Bullinger's catechism.

On account of these various qualities the catechism has obtained a certain ecumenical character within Reformed Protestantism. A broad bridge leads from the Heidelberg to the Lutheran sister confession. Within the Reformed Church theologians have based on it different theological systems (Vietius, Coccejus), and developed various religious tendencies (orthodoxy and pietism). This ecumenicity is based on the fact that the Heidelberg, leaning on the earlier Reformed catechisms, combines the deepest and most efficient religious and ethical motives of Reformed Protestantism, especially of its most important though not only branch, Calvinism, and presents them in biblical simplicity and purity.

III

The study of the original forms of worship of the German Reformed Church shows that they differed in many respects from those of Geneva and of Reformed Churches of other lands. The influence of the German spirit, and doubtless also of Melanchthonian Lutheranism, made itself felt in liturgical usage.

As in the catechism, so in the liturgy there are traces of customs and usages which are peculiar to the Reformed Church of South Germany, and which differentiate it from the Genevan and other Reformed Churches. There is no room made for free prayer which was first introduced in Geneva by Farel and accepted by Calvin. The forms for confession and the declaration of pardon are placed after the sermon. In the Order of Geneva there is no formal declaration of pardon. It is resolved into a petition for divine compassion in the opening prayer. The German hymns were used in the Palatinate, while in Geneva the Psalms alone, with the exception of two or three ancient chants, were used. The preparatory service for the communion is to be held on the previous Saturday. Its chief feature is a sermon, followed by three questions based on the three divisions of the catechism, and addressed to the congregation, who answer audibly "Yes." There is no provision made for this service by Calvin. In place of it he recommends that persons intending to approach the Lord's Table shall call upon their pastor, before the celebration of the sacrament, for the purpose of receiving spiritual instruction and counsel. In the Palatinate the Lord's Supper is to be observed at least every month in the cities, every two months in the villages, and in both on Easter, Whit-Sunday, and Christmas, and as much oftener as the necessities of the congregation may require. In Geneva a tri-monthly celebration in each parish is required. On Easter, Pentecost and Christmas the communion shall be administered in all the churches in such a way, however, that in the months in which those festivals occur it shall not be repeated.

In the first edition of the Palatinate liturgy the pericopal system is not maintained. It is directed that "the books of the New Testament, which are most profitable to the common people, and most edifying to the churches, are in preference presented and explained on Sunday." In the edition of 1585, however, there is a closer approach to the common German usage of the pericopes in the Sunday service. "Otherwise, generally, the Sunday Gospels, as they are called, shall remain. Still the people shall be reminded what the Gospel is, and that the same is to be found in Paul no less than in the Evangelists." Calvin, on the other hand, opposed the pericopes. He declared them to have been selected *"inepte nulloque judicio."* The church-year was not at first retained in

Geneva. "In the time of the Reformation," says Dr. Herzog, "the great Christian festivals were everywhere retained in Switzerland except in Geneva, where, however, the solemn observance was soon again restored."

There was apparently a more radical tendency in the reformation of worship in Geneva than in Heidelberg. This is traceable more to the influence of Farel than of Calvin. It was followed by the Scotch Presbyterians and the English Puritans. The trend in South Germany and in Switzerland generally was toward a restoration of the church-year, the use of the pericopes, and the liturgical forms. Alt says, in reference to the common practice of the Swiss and German Reformed Churches: "Besides this, it is to be noticed that already the older liturgies in regard to the liturgical prayers for the single Sundays distinguished the seasons of Epiphany, the Passion, Easter, Whitsuntide, and the last one from the fall communion to Christmas. To this must be added the practice introduced at a later period of celebrating the four weeks before Christmas as the advent season, and of beginning a new church-year with the first Sunday of Advent."

IV

The Reformed Church in the United States has always tried to be true to its heritage but it did not feel itself bound by it. It is not now an exact replica of the German or of the German Swiss Reformed Church in Europe, either of the 16th or of the 20th century. It has been a loyal member of the Alliance of Reformed Churches throughout the World holding the Presbyterian System. But it has to this day a genius of its own, as a Reformed Church; a genius different, in a measure, from the Presbyterian churches of Europe and America. This difference is due in part to the German ancestry from which it has come, to its peculiar origin and growth in the Palatinate about 1560-70, to its distinctive life and doctrine that have developed through its leaders in thought and deed for the last two hundred years in America. Its first congregations were organized by John Philip Boehm, a school teacher of Worms, Germany, in 1725 in the colony of Pennsylvania.

It appears that one could go in search for a long time for two Churches in America who, through their racial descent, their common heritage of doctrine, worship, organization, that indefinable but very vital thing that we call piety, and their present spirit and life, their aspirations and hopes, have more reason to consider favorably organic union than the Evangelical Synod of North America and the Reformed Church in the United States.

Theological Seminary, of the Reformed Church
in the United States, Lancaster, Pa.

SERMON SKETCHES

By Rev. F. W. Schroeder

Sunday — January 1

Topic: "Beginning With God."

Text: "If thy presence go not with me, carry us not up hence." Ex. 33: 15.

Introduction: How shall we begin the New Year? Formerly men adopted noble resolutions, even if only to soothe a troubled conscience. Not taken seriously; broken before the year a day old. This custom has fallen into disrepute. Today, many begin the year with gaiety and revelry. If the former was useless, this is senseless. Prayer of Moses, charged with the task of leading his people to the promised land. Suggests the one and only true way.

I. The Folly of Attempting to go Without God.

1. Though many attempt it, man cannot live long without God. Eventually he seeks some god; if not the living God, he worships the lesser gods of his own imagination or invention. Man does not cease to be credulous when he ceases to be religious. Thousands who have deserted the church and have taken up with astrology, ethical culture, Hindu cults, etc., may be cited as evidence. A prominent New York fortune teller employs a hundred assistants.

2. The futility of a godless world breaks man's spirit. Life has too many disappointments, defeats and disasters for man to endure it without drawing upon resources of comfort, courage and strength that come from realms other than those of space and time. Henley's "Invictus" may not strike a high note of trust and confidence, but even such courage as that is impossible without having a God to thank for an "unconquerable soul."

II. The Blessings of God's Presence

1. Guidance and Enlightenment. Pillar of fire and of clouds was a great help to Israelites. New Year is an unexplored country. Future is uncertain. Our problems are complex and intricate. Wisest among men needs light and enlightenment.

2. Reassurance and Comfort. Israelites were strangers in a strange land; God alone was known. In the darkness of the night a child is reassured by the presence of parent or friend. Down through mature years we crave some such assurance as this, that "underneath are the everlasting arms." Especially during tribulations and sorrow.

3. Strength and Courage. Jehovah would fight their battles; he had effected their release; brought death and destruction to Pharaoh and his army. With God on our side we are more than conquerors. "If God is for us, who can be against us."

4. Challenge and incentive to high and holy living. "Ye shall be holy for I am holy." Presence of a holy God prevents callousness and complacency. A good New Year's prayer: "Search me, O God and try my ways," etc.

Sunday — January 8

Topic: "Where Can We Find God?"

Text: "Oh that I knew where I might find Him! Job 23: 3.

Introduction: In the ancient world God was definitely localized. He dwelt in the realm just beyond the stars. Our telescopes have searched the heavens and have found nothing but empty space and star dust. Our astronomy is better, but our faith is apt to be weaker. The collapse of childhood imagery has often been accompanied with a breakdown of religious faith. Since man's knowledge of the universe does not permit belief in a space-occupying Being, he is apt to have no God at all. Job's exclamation has become a very pertinent question for many folk of today.

1. God is found in His creation. "Heavens declare the glory of God." Ps. 19: 1. God is immanent as well as transcendent. God may be the "absolute other" in a certain sense, as the Barthians say; but many of God's children have come near Him in His creation. "Earth's crammed with heaven. And every common bush aflame with God." Wonder and Beauty; Law and Order in creation.

2. God is the environment in which we live. "In Him we live and move and have our being." Acts 17: 28. Tennyson's "Higher Pantheism".

"Speak to him, thou, for He hears, and Spirit with Spirit can meet—

Closer is He than breathing, and nearer than hands and feet." "There is an inexhaustible reservoir of moral power not of ourselves but accessible to us, which enables us to rise on stepping stones of our dead selves to higher things."

3. God is found in the moral law within. "The Spirit of man is a candle of the Lord." Prov. 20: 27. Whence comes this moral imperative of must and ought, save from God. Great mystics and saints have all found God through this inner voice. "His Holy Spirit dwelleth," etc. Evang. Hymnal 268.

4. God is found through the medium of the Holy Scriptures. "God having of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets at divers times and in divers manners." Heb. 1: 1. Through the written page God becomes known to us. Evang. Hymnal 153.

5. God is found in the life of Jesus. "He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father." John 14: 9. "They shall call his name,

Immanuel"—God is with us. Jesus is the supreme revelation. God must be like that.

Conclusion: While the ultimate reality of God may go beyond our ability to grasp or understand, the avenues of approach to the discovery of God are adequate to meet the needs of life. We may not be able to discover all of God that we would like, but what we can find is real and proves to be a valuable aid to live a worth-while life.

Sunday — January 15

Topic: "How Shall We Think of God?"

Text: "Thou shalt not make unto thee a graven image, nor any likeness of any thing that is in the heavens above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth." Ex. 20: 4.

Introduction: This commandment is one answer to our question, though it is negative. While that does not satisfy us, it served a real purpose. Before the Israelites were ready to entertain a loftier conception, they had to dissociate the graven images seen in Egypt from their idea of God. While this answer did not say what God was like, it left the way open for prophets and poets to enlarge the conception of God.

Story of little girl observed drawing a picture with colored crayons. Being asked by her mother what she was doing, she said: "I am drawing a picture of God." Mother: "But nobody knows how God looks." Girl: "But they will when I get through." So most of us feel. We are not satisfied until we have created some kind of picture of God.

I. Early Attempts at Painting the Picture

1. Primitive people carved statues and drew pictures on the walls of their caves. Assyrians had strange creatures with the body of a beast, wings of the bird, and head of man. Greeks created their all too human gods dwelling on the top of Mt. Olympus. The composite picture of the past shows that each generation has added new lines while erasing old ones.

2. History of the Hebrew race shows us an unfolding and growing picture of God. First, a glorified human being walking in the garden; then a tribal deity; finally the Sovereign Ruler of all mankind.

II. The Picture of the Present

1. Modern man also attempts to paint a picture of God. Naturally it is less crude, but still not complete. The reality of God is so much larger than our understanding. Our symbols are faulty and will be superseded. "Our little systems have their day," etc. In our picture we ought to include three ideas: God is a—

2. Person. Idea of an impersonal force or cosmic energy does not satisfy. May be guilty of anthropormorphism, but as Overstreet points out, there may be a kind of childish wisdom in this. "It was in some respects a better wisdom than the later sophistication which translated the grandeur and mystery and everlasting vitality of nature into bumping atoms and struggling brutes."

3. Sovereign Ruler and Judge to whom man is accountable. Modern tendency is to think of God as an indulgent Being. Dare not lose sight of the Old Testament idea that He is the guardian of the moral structure of the world: that He does what is eternally right and demands righteousness of his people.

4. Father and Friend. Justice must be tempered with mercy. The father who succeeds best at his job is not the stern lawgiver but one who shares life with his children. God understands our needs and our problems.

Sunday — January 22

Topic: "How Shall We Worship God?"

Text: "Wherewith shall I come before Jehovah, and bow myself before the high God? Shall I come before him with burnt-offerings," etc. Micah 6: 6-8.

Introduction: Samaritan woman wanted to know where to worship. While that is a question which our age ought to consider more seriously, as evidenced by our indifference to church attendance, this question is more important. How shall we worship God?

I. Method and Technique of Worship

1. This has its place. Hebrews had a very definite and elaborate technique. Book of Leviticus very explicit. Roman Catholicism has its technique: kneeling, sign of the cross, etc. Protestantism, originally indifferent, has come to see that certain rituals and customs are aids to worship.

2. Danger of overemphasis. Technique may become end in itself. Isaiah's denunciation. Ch. 1. Ceremonialism and formalism ever are a threat to religious life. Prayers may become meaningless phrases, Matt. 6: 5-7.

3. Technique may be right, yet worship not genuine. Cain's technique as good as Abel's, yet his sacrifice found no favor. Some merely worship to pay their respects to the Almighty. Disgruntled subjects salute their king even though they despise him. Thus some worship.

II. Spirit and Attitude of Worship

1. To worship means to reverence with supreme respect; to honor with extravagant love and extreme submission. This is not

an isolated act, unrelated to the rest of life. Son who adores his mother does more than to remember her on holidays, birthdays and special occasions. He respects her wishes.

2. So the Prophet insists that worship is not merely a series of unrelated acts but a matter of doing God's will. Text: heart must be right. Psalm 51: 16-17. No sense to draw near with the lips when the heart is far away.

3. Some elements that make true worship possible.

a) Reverence. Irreverent heart vitiates the act of worship. Pharisee in the temple. Man with reverent heart will find the right posture and the right words.

b) Obedience. This is better than obeisance. 1 Sam. 15: 22. Appropriate gifts will follow quite naturally from an obedient heart.

c) Holiness. Poets of the Old Testament demanded that men worship the Lord in "the beauty of holiness"; "in holy array." Pure in heart shall see God.

Conclusion: With the right attitude our periods of public worship will be more purposive and rewarding.

Sunday — January 29

Topic: "How Shall We Serve God?"

Text: "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, which is your spiritual service." Rom. 12: 1.

Introduction: There are those who have relegated all of life's absolutes to the realm of relativities. Religion has become an elective in the school of life. Man does not have to serve God if he does not want to;—a modern attitude. Yet for any one who would live satisfactorily at all, the service of God remains as one of the great moral imperatives. How shall we serve Him?

I. Popular Misunderstanding of Service

1. Thought of as confined to special tasks. Reserved for ministers, missionaries, etc. Those who teach in the S. S. or perform other duties in the church are said to render "part time service." Having deputized someone, men feel absolved of all further responsibility.

2. Equally fallacious is the notion that man serves God when he has given a part of his time, talents, or money. Give of our surplus and go to church when there is no place else to go. God is a sort of afterthought. Isaiah's bush philosopher is a typical example. Chron. 44: 14-17.

II. Christian View of Service

1. Complete surrender of life. "Present your bodies a living sacrifice." Jesus: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, all thy soul, all thy mind." This in all of life with no areas exempted. Evang. Hymnal 252 and 317.

2. This applies in all walks of life. Distinction between secular and sacred work is misleading. All work is sacred. It is not what we do so much as how we do our work. Every task can be made a cooperative task between God and man.

III. This Service Is —

1. Spiritual. Building houses, selling merchandise, keeping books does not suggest anything spiritual; yet these ordinary tasks afford opportunity to translate spiritual values into material and temporal affairs. "Not without the body but through it the spirit must tell on the embodied spirits around us."

2. Reasonable. Word "spiritual" is also rendered "Reasonable." Complete surrender is reasonable. Demands of Jesus are difficult but reasonable; not utopian or idealistic in the sense that they are impracticable, but consistent with sound common sense. Dedicating ourselves to the service of God without any reservations is a sound and sensible way of living.

Sunday — February 5

Topic: "The Abundant Life."

Text: "That they may lay hold on the life which is life indeed." 1 Tim. 6: 19b.

Introduction: All of us want the kind of life of which we can say: "This is the life." Men differ as to what constitutes this life. Materialist like contemporaries of Noah: eat, drink and be merry. Sensualists like ancient Romans find it in self-expression and free reign of the passions. Sophists like Athenians—in dialectics and fine-spun theories. Ascetics like monks—in withdrawal from world, self-denial, etc.

Jesus announced it as his purpose that he had come that men might have life, abundant life. Above conceptions would hardly qualify as such.

I. Conditions Essential to the Abundant Life

1. The biological emancipation of man a major concern of Jesus. Was the avowed enemy of disease, poverty, oppression. Saw that the abundant life was hard to realize as long as people were suffering from these. Some of these obstacles still prevail. Economic slavery of the masses; suffering and want. Worth and sacredness of personality neither respected nor protected.

2. The spiritual emancipation even more important. Jesus the avowed enemy of ignorance, superstition, fear, and every form of sin. Jesus saw that man does not live by bread alone and that life does not consist in the abundance of things possessed. Prosperous aroused his compassion because they were spiritually enslaved Culture of the spiritual life must not be neglected.

II. Qualities of the Abundant Life

1. It is inherently self-sufficient apart from any external rewards. *The* life is an end in itself. Makes for complete self-realization. It is something that man *is* rather than what he *has*. In the beatitudes blessedness is pronounced upon a quality of life itself.

2. It must endure. *The* life must give lasting satisfaction. The test to apply: Will I always be happy to have done this? Pursuit of fame and fortune as well as most of the passing pleasures fail to qualify. The life must also endure beyond space and time.

III. Method of Attainment

1. Calls for purposeful living instead of merely working for a living. Need objective that takes one out of and beyond himself. Work together with others to help something better become real.

2. Losing one's life. Jesus: He that loseth his life shall find it. Seed must disintegrate in order to produce a new and fuller life. Happiest people are those who live in utter self-forgetfulness and serve others.

Sunday — February 12

Topic: "The Quiet Hour."

Text: "In returning and rest shall ye be saved; in quietness and confidence shall be your strength." Isa. 30: 15.

Introduction: "Not to the strong is the battle, Not to the swift is the race," Fanny Crosby. Hebrews felt their safety lay in strong armaments and swift horses. Prophet's warning: Enemies stronger and swifter. Israel's need: Place their trust in God. "Be still and know that I am God," more helpful than any other defense mechanism.

I. Our Similarity to the Hebrews

1. Obsessed with speed. Speed is king. Always in a hurry. How soon will we get there? But what do we do when we do arrive so much sooner?

2. Continuously on the go. An active age. Life an endless round of daily toil, social engagements, pleasant pastimes. What shall we do next? Where go next Sunday? Go to movies if no place else.

3. Distracted by the loud and glaring things. Blazing electric signs, immense billboards and big headlines greet us every day. In our homes all conversation and work is carried on against the background of a radio going full blast.

II. The Imperative Need of a Quiet Hour

1. Without retreat and relaxation our health is impaired. We wear ourselves out prematuraly. A shattered nervous system is the price we pay for our haste and hurry and busyness.

2. Character loss is even greater. We become shallow and superficial. Likewise callous and complacent. Holiness is sacrificed for success. We need to "take time to be holy," for it takes time to be holy.

III. The Ministries of the Quiet Hour

1. It enables us to hear the voice of God. Experience of Elijah at Horeb. 1 Kings 19: 9-13. Little wonder the voice of God is so seldom heard when we are so busy talking, doing things, and going places.

2. Sense of God's presence gives reassurance, poise, balance; opens channels of power, courage and strength. Poise of Jesus during the arrest and trial was the product of Gethsemane's quiet hour. Before facing a strenuous day Luther took extra time for devotion. Gandhi observes a day of silence.

Conclusion: Poem by Trench, "One Short Hour." "Lord, what a change within us one short hour Spent in thy presence will prevail to make," etc.

Sunday — February 19

Topic: "Living by the Spirit."

Text: "Live by the Spirit, and then you will not indulge your physical cravings." Gal. 5: 16 (Goodspeed)

Introduction: This is a good way to live though exceedingly difficult. Witness Paul's struggle as recorded in Rom. 7; disciples in the garden, "spirit willing—flesh weak"; Esau, fully conscious of his birthright advantages, yet selling it for steaming pottage.

I. Men Commonly Live by the Flesh

1. Consider the early Christians. Virtually every Pauline epistle warns against immorality, licentiousness, drunkenness, impurity. It was natural to gratify all the appetites and passions of the flesh.

2. Modern man is more refined. Nineteen centuries of Christian heritage not in vain. Modern life has aspects of decency and respectability. But while the forms of carnal-mindedness have changed, its essence still abides.

3. Evidences: Material comforts our chief concern—radios, automobiles, etc. Preoccupied with age-old question: What shall we eat, drink, wear? This Jesus denounced as the essence of paganism; and this is our paganism. More to be feared than pagan religions.

II. Living by the Spirit is a Superior Way of Living

1. Does justice to man's highest capacities. Man is essentially a spiritual being. Eddington: "Too long have we spelled mind with a small 'm'." Overstreet suggests that the real enterprise of living does not begin until we get through attending to our physical needs. Materialism as a philosophy of life has broken down, not because it is morally bad or vicious, but spiritually inadequate and insufficient.

2. A sensible way of living. Jesus commended his gospel to men not merely because it was virtuous but because it was wise. Note his frequent comparisons between wise and foolish. It is sensible to exalt the spiritual. Wordsworth: "The world is too much with us; late and soon, Getting and spending we lay waste our powers."

III. Elements Involved in this Way of Living

1. Cultivating aloofness from the world. Jesus' prayer in John 17. Paul: "Let those who mix in the world live as if they were not engrossed or absorbed in it."

2. Developing superiority to the changing fortunes. Spirit of despair and suicides in the wake of depression—evidence of our dependence on things. Moral grandeur of man whose spirit is not broken by the "bludgeonings of change" is much to be desired.

3. Acquire complete mastery over the physical nature. Tennyson in the "Evolutionist" says, "the Lord let the house of a brute to the soul of a man"; but with that heritage God also gave man the command: "Hold the sceptre, Human Soul, and rule thy province of the brute."

Sunday — February 26

Topic: "Putting on the New Man."

Text: "That ye put away, as concerning your former manner of life, the old man," etc. Eph. 4: 22-24.

Introduction: Story of man with unclean spirit. Matt. 12: 43-45. The approach of Lent suggests the need of spiritual housecleaning. However, Paul makes it quite obvious that this alone is not sufficient.

Soul left untenanted was repossessed by evil spirits. Fallow ground produces weeds. Idle brain is the devil's worshop. Tragedy

of the inner life is usually not that of a Bluebeard with shameful, secret locked away in his heart, but the more subtle tragedy of Mother Hubbard whose cupboard was bare. Old habits re-assert themselves when given a chance.

I. Breaking with the Old Man

1. May be just a matter of omitting some things from life. Art of omitting all of us need to learn. Our lives cluttered with too many things which threaten to smother the spiritual life.

2. May need to part company with certain besetting sins. Sins of the flesh such as vulgarity and sensuousness. Sins of the spirit such as avarice, envy, greed, selfishness. These far more common.

3. May call for drastic action as Jesus suggested: Better to enter life minus an eye than that the whole body perish. Moral surgery becomes necessary at times to insure spiritual health.

II. The Process of Renewal

1. Spiritual growth is not so much a matter of subtraction as addition. People think of Lent as a period to practice self-denial; good and wholesome, no doubt. Such self-discipline needed. But merely omitting something during Lent is in itself no great virtue. Need of addition becomes apparent when one contemplates the numerous sins of omission of which good people are guilty.

2. Need to take up the doing of something worth while. New man is positively good. For him the moral life is an ideal to be passionately pursued rather than certain duties to be faithfully performed. Correct life is a matter of laws observed; the good life calls for the hot and eager pursuit of a moral ideal.

3. Regenerated heart most essential of all. "That ye be renewed in the spirit of your mind." Out of the heart are the issues of life. Getting a new outlook more valuable than adding isolated virtues. Virtues follow from a regenerated heart. That is what Wm. James meant by "the expulsive power of a new affection." Paul: "If any man is in Christ he is a new creature."

CHRISTIANITY IN A NEW AGE

By Robert C. Stanger
(Professor of Biblical Literature at Elmhurst College)

At the beginning of the century William Robertson Niccol, the great English divine, said: "I pity those who shall have to fight the battle of faith in the twentieth century,"—and then after a moment of thought he said: "No, I do not pity them. I rather envy them." No amount of talk or argument can change the simple fact that religion does have a fight on its hand in the twentieth century, and that our Christian faith is being rudely challenged on every hand. Only the superficial mind can be optimistic today.

It is always dangerous to indulge in generalizations, but it is safe to say that our age is characteristically an "age of confusion." A generation ago Henry Van Dyke wrote about the "Gospel for an Age of Doubt" and said that the coat of arms of his generation might be " a question-mark rampant above two bishops dormant." Ours is not so much an age of doubt as an *age of confusion,* and its coat of arms might be an exclamation point rampant above two bishops frantic. The character of our age might well be described in terms of the high-school boy's essay in which the following sentence occurred: "The rider mounted his horse and rapidly rode off in all directions." We too seem to be going in all directions at the same time, not clear as to the aim or goal. One who reads the literature of our day or listens to conversation or engages in wide contacts must notice this sense of confusion in the intellectual or the moral or the spiritual sphere. "Open-mindedness" is the supreme virtue of the intellectual man; the theologian is a "seeker" and not a finder; the modern man wants to be "free" and finds new chains; "experimentation" is the order of the day in the realm of morals. Walter Lippmann in his great book "A Preface to Morals" begins with the quotation from Aristophanes: "Whirl is king," and pictures in a masterful way the confusion of the modern man. Underneath all of this confusion one can hear at times quite distinctly the note of wistfulness in the life of the modern man. He seems to say, like Job of old: "Oh, that I knew where I might find Him." "Having given up the faith of the fathers, many of us feel a great vacancy in our lives," says Walter Lippmann. The modern minister is surprised to find this attitude among his more thoughtful members in moments when they are ready to reveal their real thoughts to him, and he finds that by a strange process of seepage and filtration from above even the rank and file of his people have caught "from the atmosphere," as it were, this spirit of confusion and uncertainty. Most to be pitied is he who goes about his routine blissfully ignorant of any disturbance in the atmosphere.

To begin with it would be well to see "how we got this way" (to use a popular phrase),—to analyze the streams of thought which have produced the modern mind and to estimate the tendencies which have produced our modern situation. A book like Rufus Jones' "Preface to Christian Faith in a New Age" is tremendously stimulating here. Only as we try to understand the situation are we in a position to deal helpfully with it.

In the first place the entire life of our age has been dominated by the world-view of science. Ever since the second half of the nineteenth century the scientific method and outlook have gained wider and wider dominance, and almost every sphere of modern life has capitulated to the sway of the scientist and has been deeply influenced by the scientific spirit. This is not surprising, for science has expanded tremendously the range and scope of our life. It has brought control over nature, over dangers, over diseases. It has banished many of our fears and terrors. It has brought comforts and conveniences within our reach. In short, it has "made" the world in which we moderns live. None of us would want to return to the conditions of life in a pre-scientifice age. The scientific method seems to cast a spell over the minds of men. It is so absolutely convincing in its method. It bases itself upon demonstration. It produces facts that are verifiable. It submits everything to the test of experiment. It is simple, direct and mathematically accurate. One cannot in the long run set himself against the evident facts of scientific research and demonstration. It is not surprising that modern students, working in scientific laboratories and in classrooms inevitably succumb to its spell. If you want to arrive at facts and reality there is no way like the simple way of observation, analysis, experiment and generalization. At least, so it seems at first and second glance. Science has "gotten results" and that commends it to the practical man. It is not surprising, therefore, that almost unconsciously the scientific spirit has affected every aspect of our life. Even people who have never had a scientific book in their hands and have never attended a scientific lecture are affected. The "atmosphere" of modern life is charged with it and everybody is influenced by it. The method of demonstration has become almost second nature to us, and even the most conservative among us no longer react towards traditions and ancient explanations as did our forefathers. Whether we like it or not, that is what has happened. The tragic thing is that to many moderns the scientific method has become the only way of approach to truth and reality.

This emphasis on science and the scientific method leads to the world view which we call "naturalism." It is the dominant world-view in the academic world today. It conceives of the world

purely and simply in terms of cause and effect, action and reaction and in terms of mathematical formulae. From this point of view the world is a vast mechanism and the mental life of man is merely a type of physical behavior. The only real things are the things which can be seen and measured and which can be explained in terms of reason. It builds up a theory about the whole universe on the basis of the results of a small area of investigation. Evidently there is no place for anything that we call spiritual in such a world-view, which limits itself to things tangible and measurable.

Of course, the man in the street does not hold such academic views concerning the world. He has perhaps never heard of naturalism. But nevertheless this general tendency of thought filters down to him and manifests itself in practical every-day life in what we term *"secularism."* This is the blight of modern life. It puts the primary emphasis on *things* that can be seen and handled. Everything which we term "the unseen" or "the intangible" or "the higher values' loses in significance or recedes entirely. Science has blessed us with such a multiplicity of things that there is neither time nor room for interest in spiritual things. Things which can be seen and touched bulk large, and there comes a tragic narrowing of life and a limiting of horizons. As a matter of fact few people would admit that this is their creed of life, but unconsciously they do accept it. The drift is in that direction and the drift carries the mass of men along with it. This world is all there is, for this world is all that can be seen. Life loses its significance and value. It must be admitted that if life is lived merely on the superficial, material level there are no needs which religion can supply today. There is nothing that such a man needs which a "beyond" or a "spiritual order" could supply. All he needs is supplied by science. If he therefore has any religion, and it seems we cannot get along without some religion, it is a type of humanism which glorifies human powers and makes man an end in himself. Consequently the chief end of man in the new catechism is "to glorify man and to enjoy him forever." Faith can be reduced to the paraphrase of Chesterton: "The machine is thy refuge and underneath thee are the everlasting wheels." Secularism is the great enemy of the faith in our day.

Another element which has affected our thought-life is the idea of *relativity*. All we need to say is that the idea of relativity has entered deeply into the current of modern life. It has affected the atmosphere which we all breathe. It has undermined the stability of faith. What room is there in a world of relativity for absolutes, for the good, for the right? What becomes of the moral imperative, of the "ought" and "must," which impressed Kant so deeply? Is there anything unchanging and eternal? What happens to the

moral code, which once was thundered from Sinai? Moral standards are merely social customs and each age make its own morals. We must make the most of the present moment and not be bound by time-worn standards. Granted that moral standards do change, as undoubtedly they do, and that social custom determines our codes of conduct to a large degree, yet we must recognize that there is something permanent and abiding in life underlying the transient and passing forms. The leaves and branches may change but the great roots remain. There is something in the very constitution of the universe to which we can appeal, unless we are to lose all our moorings and to drift aimlessly with the inevitable consequence of all drifting.

Then too there has come in the wake of the world war a *tremendous disillusionment* which has had far-reaching effects. "Democracy," that charmed word and others such as freedom and equality are not held with the same enthusiasm as in other days. In one area after another in Europe or here at home it has been found inadequate to the terrific task in hand. The chaotic conditions in politics and social life have been a source of profound disillusionment. In our own country and in the whole world today, it is becoming evident that the economic problem is too big for us. Many see in the present situation signs of the disintegration of the foundations of the present capitalistic order and it would seem the part of wisdom to admit the fact (although the collapse may yet be far from imminent). Nothing is to be gained by refusing to face the facts about the modern social and economic situation. As a matter of fact, the economic question is for most people the most pressing problem of the day, and a religion which will not reckon with that is not dealing with the real problems of modern people.

Having traced briefly, perhaps too briefly, the factors which have entered into the making of the modern mind, we turn to consider the bearing of this on the thought-world of religion. It is quite evident that in religious thought we are witnessing the end of an era, just as we are witnessing it in the realm of business and of finance, of social life. One need hardly say that the transition is a gradual one, but signs are not lacking that the post-war decade is ending. The depression hastened its close, but the process was already well under way before this event. From the newer books and magazine articles, from lectures and from contacts here and there one gathers certain impressions and can note several distinct tendencies in the newer thought about religion.

There is in the first place a *new attitude towards science.* The characteristic of the thought-world of the past twenty-five or thirty years has been the complete dominance of the scientific method and point of view.

The values of the scientific point of view and its practical benefits are only too evident. Little wonder that the thought-world of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century capitulated entirely to science. Even religion succumbed to its influence. The genius of the whole liberal movement in religion was to bring theology into harmony with the spirit and findings of modern science. It wanted to make Christianity "intellectually respectable." This effort ought not to be criticized unduly for religion must express itself in terms of the thought of the times. But what was not completely recognized was that in freeing ourselves from the old dogmatism of religion we were submitting to a new and more deadly dogmatism, that of science. Modern science has been as intolerant and as dogmatic in its assertions as theology ever was. The heretic of other days was the man who questioned the dogmas of theology. The heretic of our day is the man who questions the dogmas of science. Just as a person was afraid to be called "unorthodox" once upon a time, so now he fears to be called "unscientific." The very simple phrase "unscientific" is enough to send the shivers up and down the spine of the modern man.

We have been talking a great deal about "adapting" religion to the thought-world of science, of "harmonizing" the two. Every advance of science has been met by a new strategic adjustment on the part of religion. Since when must religion do all the adapting? Why not speak about the adapting of science to new religious insights? Religion speaks in its own right. It, too, deals with reality and has a right to utter its convictions without qualification. The great religious leaders, the prophets, the founders of religion, spoke forth their convictions without a look to the right or left. The point is simply this—the commonly accepted attitude on the part of large numbers of people educated in modern colleges and universities has been that the scientific method is the only approach to truth and reality that is worthy of respect. The scientific method has distinct limitations. It deals quite satisfactorily with certain aspects of reality, with external facts, with tangibles. But there are aspects of reality which it does not touch. It does not bring us knowledge of values. There is a reality which cannot be reduced to relations of cause and effect, which cannot be measured quantitatively, which cannot be weighed in the scales. It is the type of reality which the poet, the artist, the religious prophet perceives—which all of us perceive in the daily experience of life. It concerns the world of values. Here, for example, is a bunch of roses. One legitimate approach to it it the scientific approach—to discover the facts about the rose—its coloration, definite size, clearly defined parts. But when you have stated this you have not told all there is to be told. A rose is more than that. It is beautiful, it conveys

sentiment, it may inspire a poem or a song. Who can deny that the latter approach is not equally valid? Professor Whitehead somewhere has a statement to the effect that the influence which saved religion from completely falling under the dominance of the assumptions of mechanistic science was the intuitive protest of the poets. They felt "that something had been left out and that what had been left out comprised everything that was important." While we recognize, therefore, the value and the legitimacy of the scientific method, we are quite right in challenging vigorously its presumption and arrogance in claiming the whole domain of life.

In this connection we must note another characteristic of modern life growing out of this domination by the scientific method, namely, the undue prominence given to reason as a guide to knowledge. Many of the tenets of religion have been abandoned because they were said to be "unreasonable." One finds this tendency quite markedly among college students. This pride of reason is one of the tragic, if not pathetic things, about modern people. If one but stops to think for a moment it becomes evident that there are many ways of arriving at knowledge. Most of the things we are firmly convinced of having not been arrived at by reason at all. We learn by experience. We accept more than we are willing to recognize by authority. We arrive at some truth by a process of *intuition.* The things we are most sure of are the things we cannot explain by reason at all—love of father or mother, of husband or wife, the faithfulness of friends, so many of the things which enter into the warp and woof of our life, and we would be hard put if we were to defend them by reason. Was it not Pascal who said: "The heart has its reasons which the head does not know."

Another startling factor in the modern situation, and one all to little recognized, is the development within science itself within the past few years. To put it briefly, modern science has been moving steadily away from the old materialistic presuppositions in the direction of, what we might call for lack of a better phrase, a more "spiritual" interpretation of reality. The new physics quite definitely points in that direction. The universe is thought of today not in terms of atoms or molecules of matter, but in terms of *energy.* There is in the last analysis no such thing as matter. The final word is "energy." No wonder that the president of the British Association for the Advancement of Science in his presidential address for 1931 said: "Materialism has practically disappeared. The ancient spiritual goods and heirlooms of the race need not ruthlessly be scrapped." Read the statements of men like Haldane or Eddington or Jeans or Whitehead and you will find them supporting this point of view. The statement of Jeans in his "Mysterious Universe" has become almost a modern classic: "Today there is widespread agree-

ment, which on the physical side of science amounts almost to unanimity, that the stream of knowledge is heading towards a non-mechanical reality. The universe begins to look more like a great thought than a great machine. Mind no longer appears as an accidental intruder into the realm of matter." The advance of science has cut the foundation from under the older materialism. Recognizing this tendency of modern science, how can we account for the stream of out and out materialistic teaching which issues from many of our colleges and high schools and state universities? The bald fact is that a large majority of average science teachers do not know the latest developments of science. While the great leaders are overcoming materialism, these lesser lights go on serenely retailing the old materialism. The tragedy of the modern university student is that he goes on blissfully unaware of the latest developments of science. Nothing weighs so heavily upon the spirits of the great religious leaders in the student world today as this fact. One recalls that the word "pagan" is derived from the Latin word "pagani," meaning the dwellers in the rural regions to whom the news came very slowly or very late. In more than one sense we are dealing in the academic world of our day with pagans. They have not heard the latest news.

A second major tendency of our time is evident in the *decline of liberalism* today. Liberal theology is increasingly losing in favor and is felt to be inadequate to the needs of our day. (This does not mean that fundamentalism has finally won out in the struggle. It is even less adequate to the needs of our times, and is still carrying on violent fighting on fronts from which the enemy has long ago retired.) By liberalism I mean the modern and progressive school of thought whose endeavor it was to bring theology into harmony with the prevailing scientific world-view. It sought to make Christianity "intellectually respectable" without giving up any of the traditional values. It was in part quite successful in its day. It has two distinct gains to its credit. It has disposed of the old struggle between science and religion, and it has quite clearly established the historical approach to the Bible as the only justifiable and satisfactory one. In addition it has fought for the right of the individual to think for himself, and for the authority of the inner, personal experience. It has made a tremendous contribution to the religious life along the lines indicated. It has saved the faith of many a modern man caught in the struggle between a static faith and a changing world view. One must speak of the liberal movement in terms of appreciation if one is to be fair. The general feeling seems to be not that liberalism has failed, but that it has served its purpose. It has been outgrown. The things for which it contended are quite generally accepted by intelligent Chris-

tians today. The assured results of science are accepted by Christians without difficulty; the historical approach to the Bible is firmly established; freedom of thought and toleration of divergent viewpoints are quite general. And yet, grateful as we are for all of this, we cannot help feeling that the heart of the matter has not been touched. The general criticism of liberalism might well include the fact that it has been largely *negative* in its approach, a point which is easily explained by the fact that liberalism had to hold its position very often as over against a narrow and hidebound conservatism. Nevertheless, this does not obscure the fact that its approach has been negative. Its strategy has been *defensive*. It has sought to protect religion against every new advance of scientific thought. It has often been content to talk about religion rather than to experience it. It was cool and deliberate in its treatment of religion, rather than ardent and passionate. All of this perhaps accounts for the fact that it did not seem to grip people deep down; it developed surface enthusiasm, but little deep-going loyalty, little of what once was known as "consecration." It somehow lacked "punch" or power. Professor Van Dusen of Union Seminary, New York, published a significant article in the "World Tomorrow" (August, 1931), entitled "The Sickness of Liberal Religion." He says concerning Liberalism: "with the most sincere motives in the world it has betrayed the cause of true religion." In its eagerness to harmonize religion with the world of modern thought it has resorted to compromise. It has toned the message of religion down where necessary. It sought an easy reconciliation with new thought currents. It proposed what Professor Van Dusen calls a "minimum interpretation" of religion. It tried to prove that belief in God is logically possible, which is a most futile procedure in trying to maintain faith in a living God. God is always the first fact of experience not the last step in an intellectual argument. It would indeed be essaying the role of prophet to tell what turn Christian thought is going to take in our time. It would be safe to say that it will be positive, that it will be conservative (in the best sense of the word) that it will be more aggressive and vital than the religion of liberalism has been. It may be mentioned in passing that there is every indication that the new movement in modern religion will be in some such direction as that indicated by the school of Karl Barth. This movement, as represented, for instance, by Brunner, has made a positively devastating indictment of modern liberalism. There seems to be no indication that Barthianism as such will gain a large foothold in our own country. Barthianism is a European movement and can only be understood against the background of the deplorable social and spiritual situation in the old world. Our circumstances are different in many

ways. But the remarkable thing about the Barthian movement is the way it stimulates and grips even those who do not agree with it completely. It seems likely that out of this stimulation some thing new and vital will shape itself. Perhaps more than anything else our own desperate spiritual need will lead to a new, first-hand experience of religion.

A third and most interesting tendency of our times is the *new emphasis on personal religion.* The distinctive feature of American religion during the last quarter of a century and more has been its emphasis on the "social gospel." Here American Christianity has taken a position of undoubted leadership. It is interesting to note that the social gospel began to be preached when the social problem became prominent in our country, i.e., with the rise of modern industrialism. The social situation necessitated the social emphasis. All told the preaching of the social gospel represents a bright and glowing chapter in American religious life.

It is interesting to note the renewed emphasis in our day on the development of the personal resources of religion. Notice the newer type of church architecture and the new emphasis on *worship,* on the individual experience of the presence of God. Notice the increasing practise of *silence* as an aid to personal religion. The *communion* service is being used more largely than ever before. (At the Lake Geneva Student Conference this summer a communion service held outdoors was the climax of the Conference—something never tried before.) More and more individuals and groups are holding what they term "retreats," i.e., meetings with a definite devotional emphasis. The Y. M. C. A. is reviving what once was called the "Morning Watch" in its "Fellowship of Discipline." According to accounts in the daily papers the Methodist Camp Meeting of the Chicago area changed its emphasis this year. For many years social Christianity held the center of attention, but this year the speakers have "by popular request" (as the newspapers put it) devoted themselves to problems of personal religion and the devotional life. Kirby Page, who has long been outstanding advocate of the social application of the gospel, and who has written numerous books on the subject, has this year published a book, entitled "Creative Living," outlining ten steps for the rediscovery of the resources of religion for personal life. The book is largely concerned with the larger problems, but its emphasis is personal. These are just a few illustrations to indicate the general trend. How can we account for it? Perhaps the simplest explanation is that it was easier to preach social Christianity in days of comparative security. But today when the crisis is upon us and the only consistent thing to do is to boldly challenge the present system, we find we do not have enough resources within us, not enough courage and stamina.

How could Jesus have challenged the existing order of his day unless he had found the resources enabling him to face the crisis in his own private religion? So we turn once more to discover for ourselves those inner resources which are available in religion, in the development of which we superficial moderns have been so poor and niggardly.

One might go on pointing out newer tendencies here and there. What we have said above is sufficient to indicate the changes which are taking place in the world of religion. Our age of confusion presents a distinct challenge to the Christian church. It has always been the genius of religion to offer assurance and certainty to the souls of men. Can we bring certainty and assurance to our age of confusion?

THE EVANGELICAL SYNOD OF N. A.

Its Attitude toward Religious Liberty and the Freedom of Church and State*

*Submitted at the Washington Celebration, held at Fredericksburg, Va., Oct. 16, 1932, by our representative.

By Professor C. E. Schneider

Among the foreign migrations to American shores in quest of that liberty and freedom which the spirit of Washington had imparted to the genius of this new nation, none arrived with higher hopes and none with hopes to be so gloriously fulfilled as those who came from the home of Goethe, Beethoven and Kant. It was not the privilege of the Evangelical Synod of North America to participate in the creative struggles of the colonial period under the leadership of Muehlenberg and Schlatter. Our origin dates from the early part of the nineteenth century when the political and sociological conditions prevailing in the old world brought to the shores of America and to the far West of our country a new and unique type of German immigrant. Political liberals and religious and ecclesiastical dissenters sought in this country for the realization of the dreams of religious liberty which the state-church structure of Germany could not fulfill.

In the untrammeled freedom of the far West, on the unrestricted expanse of the western frontier where new interpretations of American freedom were constantly being born, there arose an entirely new and independent German church, indigenous to American soil and one of the most unique sociological products in the history of American religious life—the so-called "Kirchenverein des Westens." (Church Association of the West). Through the ever widening experiences of a cumulative Americanization process this religious organization finally emerged as the *Evangelical Synod of North America,* a glowing tribute to the dynamic power vested in the American ideal of religious freedom and the separation of the state and the church. An immigrant group had participated anew in the struggle for religious liberties and discovered in its unfolding life the blessing which the spirit of Washington had bequeathed to his country as the perennial heritage of all those who would vicariously participate in the great American adventure.

From its very inception the Evangelical Synod of North America stood forth, not as an importation from abroad, nor subsidized by foreign eclesiastical interests. Indeed, with German traditions which could not be effaced, with German temper and German soul nourished by the spirit of Luther and Calvin, the founders of this religious community, mostly pietistic emissaries of the Basel and Barmen mission institutions, yet found themselves wedded to Amer-

ican soil and imbibed the liberal traditions of their new fatherland. Thus new ecclesiastical forms and religious thought-patterns became established into which was woven the genius of American liberty and freedom of thought.

The mind and soul of man was not to be bound by slavish adherence to the creedal formulations of previous generations. The genius of the new-found fatherland seemed to find expression in the doctrinal paragraph of this infant church which held that the interpretation of the Word of God as the norm for faith and life was not authoritatively established by any creed composed by man, but must also be measured by recourse to the conscience of the individual. Where conscience is bound, whether by precedence, formal decrees or any ecclesiastical restraints, the spirit of the freeman is threatened. We believe that the stuff of which freedom is made belongs to the very essence of God who is spirit and must be worshipped in spirit and in truth. Historic creeds may serve as monitors in the search of the soul for the eternal and infinite verities of God, but there are no man-made tracks nor beaten paths to lead the faltering steps of man into the presence of his Creator. Challenged by the intriguing environment of a free America the bounding spirit of John Robinson fervently proclaimed that "the Lord has more truth yet to break forth out of His holy word." In the same venturesome spirit the German pilgrims of the thirties and forties sought to free themselves from human authority and to build more stately mansions for their souls.

We, furthermore, owe it to the spirit of American religious liberty that, in the fashioning of our ecclesiastical structure, our fathers avoided the snares of bureaucratic government. Old world forms could not be perpetuated in the new world environment. The rights of individuals to expression in matters of church must be safeguarded. The autonomy of congregations in the management of their affairs shall not be violated by synodical decrees. The functioning of our church-governing agencies shall be as free and unimpaired as that of the respective states in the federal commonwealth. Thus in its modest way the Evangelical Synod of North America would add its mite of testimony in refutation of the Hegelian theory, that the state is a self-sufficient end in itself where the rights of individuals play a supplicant role.

From the time of its origin, in view of the mixed confessional constituency of its early members, and in the light of a union tradition inherited from the fatherland, the "Kirchenverein des Westens" endowed itself with the mission of espousing a fraternal relationship between the Lutheran and Reformed denominations. Under the subtle impact of the union idea, expressed in the American democracy, a wider interpretation of this union ideal inevitably

arose. Not only is the Evangelical Synod a charter member of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, co-operating in various similar projects of church union and inter-church activities, but, consistent with its union temper, it is today in the midst of deliberations looking toward an organic merger with another denomination.

In full recognition of the blessings accruing to the Church and the Christian citizen in a state, where the principles of religious liberty are so firmly established as in the American democracy, we cannot refrain from submitting that in a higher sense religious liberty is not a gift of the State, nor may it be assured by state sanctions. True religious liberty is born of a divine order which transcends the civic domain to the extent of imposing ethical and moral obligations on the Government itself. Indeed the sanctions of a state, where religious liberty is a postulate, will assure for each of its citizens unquestioned freedom in all actions born of moral purity and ethical integrity. If, in the spirit of Washington, the American government assures its citizenry freedom and liberty in the exercise of religion, by that same maxim no moral passion or ethical ideal dare be crushed by governmental expediency. It were better to have exercised honest zeal in an unworthy cause than to have moral effort standardized by norms imposed from without. Rarely in American history has the validity of the principles of self-government, freedom and democracy been subject to such caustic criticism as now. Having been the recipient of its blessings the church may now turn to serve its patron. Having basked in the sunshine of Washington's idealism it may now be possible for the church to assist the state in re-defining its ethic and help solve its problems of class and race. May the time soon come when both State and Church will recognize that the principles of true Democracy are grounded in the realms of the Absolute. Committed to this truth, the State may then be the first to recognize a love higher than love of country and an obedience more noble than obedience to State. Then there will have been born a Democracy well pleasing in the eyes of God, and the spirit of Washington will have been vindicated by its fruits.

Die Betätigung des christlichen Charakters in Geselligkeit und Freundschaft.

Von Professor Dr. Grützmacher.

Die erste Naturgemeinschaft, in welche der Mensch hineingestellt wird, ist die Familie. Innerhalb ihrer hat sich auch der christliche Charakter zunächst zu betätigen. Aus der Familie erwachsen die Kultur-, Arbeits- und Rechtsgemeinschaft. Sie alle aber haben sich im Lauf der Entwicklung mehr und mehr von der Familie gelöst und sind zu selbständigen sozialen Gebilden geworden. Eine verhältnismäßig enge Verbindung mit der Familie hat der gesellige Zusammenschluß behalten. Er dient vornehmlich der Erholung. Ihrer bedarf der Mensch, so gut wie der Arbeit und der Ermüdung. Gerade um berufstüchtig zu bleiben und sittlich-sozialen Dienst zu leisten, müssen Leib und Seele ihre Pausen haben zur Sammlung neuer Kräfte. Diese können gewiß auch in der Einsamkeit und durch absolute Ruhe gewonnen werden, aber nicht minder in der freien Verbindung und im gegenseitigen Austausch mit andern Menschen. Für ihn ist die nächste naturgegebene Form die Familie. Die ihr zu Grund liegenden Bande des Blutes lassen leichter auch die Geister sich sympathisch verbinden, ermöglichen ein sich Gehenlassen und eine entspannende Formlosigkeit, die von Fremden nicht verstanden und ertragen würde. Wo die Familie diesen Dienst nicht mehr leistet und die Erholung nur außerhalb ihrer, etwa in Vereinen und Zusammenschlüssen mit völlig Fernstehenden, gesucht wird, ist das ein Zeichen ungesunder und unethischer Zustände. **Der christliche Charakter wird darum die Familie als erste Erholungsstätte betrachten und, wo sie es nicht mehr ist, sie dafür zurückzugewinnen suchen.** Sowenig sich in moderner Zeit die patriarchalische Form einer ausschließlich an das Elternhaus gebundenen Geselligkeit für die Jugend — etwa durch den Zwang gemeinsamer Sonntagnachmittagspaziergänge — erneuern läßt, so bleibt es doch Ziel, daß die gerade durch die Arbeit meist getrennte moderne Familie, wenigstens an Festen frei und froh sich zusammenfindet. Die Familie bedarf allerdings der Ergänzung und Erweiterung durch Menschen mit anderm Horizont, besonderen Gaben und nicht gekannten Ideen. Heimat und Ferne in rechter Mischung bringen dem Menschen leiblich und geistig die stärkste Erholung. So erweitert sich die Familie zur geselligen Gemeinschaft. Jesus ging auch in die Häuser andrer Menschen und nahm an ihren Hochzeiten teil. Luther sah an seinem Tisch fast täglich fremde Gäste. Sache der Individualität wird es sein, ob man der außerhäuslichen Geselligkeit freiere oder gebundenere Form gibt. Der moderne Mensch ist trotz oder gerade vielleicht wegen seines Individualismus geneigt, sich auch für

dem, wozu sie da sind: Erholung. Glücksspiele, die auf Gelderwerb zur Ergänzung oder gar zum Ersatz des Arbeitsverdienstes ausgehen, scheiden erst recht aus der Harmlosigkeit gesellschaftlichen Zusammenseins aus. Betrug im Spiel ist naturgemäß ebenso verwerflich, wenn nicht noch verwerflicher, wie im wirklichen Leben, weil niemand auf ihn gefaßt ist. Scheinbare Täuschung im Spiel ist dagegen nicht wider die Wahrheit, weil sie von Anfang an von allen Mitspielenden als Spielregel zugestanden ist.

Der **Tanz** — hier nicht als ernste Kunst verstanden und als solche erst später mit zu würdigen —, sondern **als eine Form der geselligen Unterhaltung trägt keine Wesenszüge, die ihn für den christlichen Charakter von vornherein verwerflich machen.** Die Geschichte des Tanzes zeigt allerdings öfter Formen und zwar nicht nur in der Gegenwart, sondern auch in der „guten alten Zeit," die ihn in engste Verbindung mit unethischem Verhalten, besonders auf sexuellem Gebiet zeigen. Aber das ist nicht eine spezifische Eigentümlichkeit des Tanzes, sondern auch ohne ihn möglich, während gerade der Tanz nur Ausdrucksbewegung fröhlicher Jugend sein kann. Zwei Lutherworte geben der reformatorischen Stellung zu dieser Frage Ausdruck. Zu Genesis 24, der Heirat der Rebekka, bemerkt Luther: „Also möchte man nun vom Tanzen reden, daß man davon sagt, er bringe viel Reizung zur Sünde, aber es kann auch einer wohl mit Einer buhlen, die weder Schmuck noch Schöne hat. Darum, weil Tanzen auf der Welt Brauch ist des jungen Volkes, das zur Ehe greift, so es auch züchtig und ohne schandbare Weise, Worten oder Gebärden nur zur Freude geschieht, ist es nicht zu verdammen. Das hat Gott hiermit angezeigt, daß er's also läßt schreiben, daß nicht die hoffärtigen Heiligen sobald Sünde daraus machen, wenn man es nur nicht zum Mißbrauch macht." In einer Bemerkung zu Sach. 8, 5 geht Luther noch einen Schritt weiter und macht den Tanz zu einem für Gott und Christus wohlgefälligen Spiel: „Item merke auch, wie das Kinderwerk, als Spielen und Tanzen der jungen Welt auf den Gassen nicht böse Ding ist, sondern Gott wohlgefällig. Christus wird sagen, daß der Kinder Singen und Tanzen auf den Gassen ihm lieber sei, denn all ihr Geheule und Gemurre in den Kirchen, und daß der Mägdlein Kränze und Puppen, der Knaben Roßstecken und rote Schuhe ihm viel mehr gefallen, denn alle ihre Platten, Kappen, Chorhemd und Schmuck."

Ein Lutherwort kann uns auch den Weg weisen zu der rechten Stellung des christlichen Charakters gegenüber einer gerade im geselligen Leben besonders hervortretenden Erscheinung, dem sogenannten **Luxus d. h. dem Mehraufwand in Darbietung und Genuß über das unmittelbar Lebensnotwendige hinaus.** Luther meint einmal drastisch: „Darf unser Herrgott gute große Hechte und einen guten

rheinischen Wein schaffen, so darf ich sie wohl auch essen und trinken. Du kannst jede Lust auf der Welt haben, die nicht sündlich ist." Luther geht hier von der Schöpfungstatsache aus, daß in der Welt an Quantität und Qualität mehr Güter vorhanden sind, als für die unmittelbare und reizlose Befriedigung des Lebensbedarfes notwendig sind. Darin sieht er eine Aufforderung Gottes, auch diesen Ueberschuß und seine Lust zu genießen. Allein mit dieser Erwägung ist die Frage nach der Berechtigung des Luxus doch noch nicht erledigt, wenn es sich um den Aufwand des Einzelnen oder einer größeren Gesamtheit handelt. **Luxus ist ein relativer Begriff;** für den einen Menschen ist der Gebrauch besondrer Reinigungsmittel schon ein Luxus, während er für einen andern Selbstverständlichkeit, ja Notwendigkeit ist. In Kriegs- und Notzeiten stellen viele Nahrungsmittel etwas Luxuriöses dar, während sie im Frieden jedem zugänglich sind. Darum läßt sich nicht ein allgemein gültiges Urteil in dem Sinn fällen, daß bestimmte Luxusgüter objektiv stets verwerflich oder stets berechtigt sind. Vielmehr ist das Problem vom subjektiv persönlichen Standpunkt aus anzufassen und zu lösen. **Der Einzelne darf sich nur dann irgendeine Luxus gestatten, wenn er tatsächlich über die für ihn aufzuwendenden Mittel verfügt und diese nicht auf Kosten andrer individueller oder sozialer Notwendigkeiten aufbringt.** Mag — um an Luthers Beispiel anzuknüpfen — auch guter rheinischer Wein auf Erden vorhanden sein, so fragt es sich doch noch, ob ich das nötige Geld zu seiner Erwerbung habe, und wenn ich es dafür verwende, ob ich damit nicht meinen Kindern nährendes Brot entziehe. Erst die gewissenhafte Abwägung und Verhältnisbestimmung zwischen Unumgänglichem und Wünschenswertem gibt jeweils das Recht, auch das letztere zu erwerben. Der sozial und erst recht christlich gesinnte Charakter wird weiter erwägen, ob er nicht mit seinem überflüssigen Geld erst Bedürftigen zu helfen hat, ehe er sich selbst mit Luxusgütern versieht. Von diesem Gesichtspunkt scheint sich sogar eine radikale Verwerfung jedes Luxus zu ergeben, denn immer wird es in unsrer näheren oder ferneren Umgebung Menschen geben, die alle unsre Mittel gut gebrauchen können. Aber gerade wer sich hier des Wortes Jesu erinnert: „Arme habt ihr allezeit bei euch," wird sich auch seines Zweckes erinnern, nämlich den Vorwurf seiner Jünger abzuwehren, daß ein Weib ein Luxusgut, köstliche Narde, zur Salbung Jesu verwandt hatte, statt, wie jene es wollten, den Erlös dafür den Armen zu geben. Jesus hält es für berechtigt, daß man ihm durch einen besonderen Aufwand huldigt und auch im Gleichnis vom reichen Mann und armen Lazarus hat er nicht verlangt, daß jener auf jeden Gebrauch seines Reichtums verzichte, sondern nur getadelt, daß er sich nicht auch zugleich des armen Lazarus helfend erinnerte, der vor seiner Tür lag. Der Gebrauch von Luxusgütern soll im entsprechenden Verhältnis zur

Unterstützung der Bedürftigen stehen. Unter modernem volkswirtschaftlichen Gesichtspunkt ergibt sich, daß gerade Luxusgüter und ihre Herstellung vielen Menschen erst ermöglichen, das tägliche Brot zu verdienen. Fortfall jedes Luxus führt wirtschaftliche Katastrophen herbei und schädigt weitere Kreise mehr, als durch noch so reichliche Almosen gutgemacht werden kann. Der christliche Charakter kann darum den Luxus nicht einfach ablehnen, sondern er ist im einzelnen Fall zu ernster und sorgsamer Abwägung genötigt, wann Luxus sittlich berechtigt und wann er verwerflich ist.

Enger und tiefer als die bisher erörterte Geselligkeit verbindet die Menschen die **Freundschaft. Sie hat eine naturhafte Basis und beruht auf der Anziehung voneinander verschiedenen und doch wieder entsprechenden Individualitäten.** Jeder Mensch besitzt neben den Merkmalen, die ihn mit Anderen verbinden, wie Geschlechtlichkeit, Rasse, Nationalität, Lebensalter, noch eine Besonderheit, die er ganz sein Eigen nennt. Zu den Schöpfungswundern gehört es, daß schon das Aeußere jedes der Milliarden Menschen irgendeinen Zug besitzt, der in dieser Form einem andern Antlitz nicht eignet. Seelisch ist das Gleiche der Fall. In dieser Individualität sieht der Mensch, sonderlich in moderner Zeit, einen besonders wertvollen Besitz, ein Pfund, mit dem gerade er zu wuchern hat. Aber in der Individualität steckt von Natur auch eine antisoziale Tendenz, die sich ohne Rücksicht, ja nicht selten auf Kosten der Anderen geltend machen will. Gerade die Epochen und Kreise, in denen starke Individualitäten hervortreten, wie etwa in der Renaissance oder in der Sphäre von Künstlern und Gelehrten, zeigen die heftigsten Spannungen. Als Gegengewicht hat die Natur eine Kraft geschaffen, die zur Verbindung der Individualitäten in der Freundschaft treibt. Wer sich eines starken Eigenbesitzes bewußt ist, empfindet die Neigung ihn zu verwerten, andern gegenüber „schenkende Tugend" zu üben. Ein solcher Mensch ist aber auch bereit und verlangend, Gegengaben zu empfangen, sich die besonderen Schätze fremder Individualitäten anzueignen. Schwache Persönlichkeiten sind viel unfähiger zu geben und zu nehmen, als starke. **Die Freundschaft schafft die Verbindung zwischen echten Individualitäten zu wechselseitiger Hingabe und Hinnahme.** Sie ist darum von Natur schon auf eine soziale Verbindung angewiesen. **Im christlichen Sinn ist die Freundschaft zunächst, genau wie die Familie, eine vorsittliche Erscheinung und kann darum sowohl eine Förderung, wie eine Gefährdung des christlichen Charakters bringen.** Wie die Blutsgemeinschaft sich egoistisch in kollektiver Familienpflege abschließen kann, so vermag auch die Freundschaft einzelne Menschen gegen das große Ganze hermetisch abzusondern. Aber auch umgekehrt wie die Familie zum Altruismus zunächst innerhalb ihrer Grenzen, dann aber auch außerhalb ihrer zu erziehen vermag, so ist das auch in und durch die Freundschaft möglich. Bei jeder

fremden Individualität werden — auf die Dauer — nicht nur anziehende, sondern auch abstoßende Eigenschaften sichtbar; der natürliche Egoismus neigt dann mehr zum Versagen und zum Verurteilen, als zum Schenken und zum Verzeihen. In diesem Fall kann die Freundschaft das Mittel werden und die Kraft geben, auch fremdartige Züge im Charakter des Menschen zu ertragen, Verletzungen leichter zu vergeben und zu überwinden. Die Freundschaft macht fähig, Opfer zu bringen und sich auch wertvollen Eigenbesitzes zu entäußern. **Die Freundschaft unterstützt durch natürliche Sympathie den christlichen Charakter in dem rechten Verhalten zum Nächsten.** Was der Einzelne gegenüber einem Freund gelernt hat, wird er dann im weiteren menschlichen Gemeinschaftsleben verwenden können. Er wird auch in diesem nicht mehr jede Eigenart einer anderen Individualität beseitigen wollen, sondern sie nicht nur achten, sondern auch lieben. Durch die Freundschaft wird das Grundproblem im sozialen Leben, wie Verschiedenheit und Einheit gleichermaßen verwirklicht werden können, einer Lösung näher geführt. Der Gegensatz der Stände und Parteien kann stark gemildert und die Kämpfe von unsittlicher Schärfe befreit werden, wenn hüben und drüben Freunde stehen, die ihren persönlichen Zusammenschluß trotz sachlicher Unterschiede behaupten.

Die Freundschaft gewinnt erhöhten sittlich-sozialen Wert, wenn sie ihre Naturkraft in den Dienst objektiver Zwecke stellt. Die geschichtliche Erfahrung lehrt, daß freundschaftliche Verbindung von großer Bedeutung für die Entstehung bedeutsamer kultureller Güter ist. Eine moderne Betrachtungsweise will sogar die Entstehung des Staates auf die in primitiven Männerbünden herrschende Freundschaft zurückführen. Fraglos sind in der Geschichte grundlegende Aenderungen und Verfassungsformen, wie die Tyrannis, auf die Entschlußfähigkeit von Freunden zurückzuführen; auch in Kriegen und Siegen der Menschheit spielen Freundschaften keine geringe Rolle. Auch christliche Charaktere gewinnen an Stoßkraft, wenn sie freundschaftlich verbunden sind. Am Schluß seines Lebens spricht Jesus zu seinen Jüngern im johanneischen Evangelium: „Ihr seid meine Freunde." Er tut das nicht nur um anzudeuten, wie das reine Autoritäts- und Unterordnungsverhältnis zwischen Meister und Jünger jetzt dank seiner Erziehungsarbeit in ein gewisses Gleichheitsverhältnis übergegangen ist. Er will vielmehr die Seinen durch ihre Bezeichnung als Freunde stärken und anfeuern, ganz für seine Sache einzutreten. Man läßt sein Leben leichter für seine Freunde. Der persönlichste Freund Jesu, Johannes, hat dasjenige Evangelium geschrieben, das am tiefsten in das Wesen Jesu blicken läßt. Die allgemeine christliche Bruderliebe wird durch die besondre Freundesliebe nicht geschädigt, sondern gestärkt. Darum ist ihre Pflege ein Recht, ja eine Pflicht für den christlichen Charakter.

Das gute Recht des sozialen Christentums.

Pastor Dr. G. Fr. Schuetze.

Eins der modernen Schlagwörter unsrer Zeit ist die Forderung eines „sozialen" Christentums. Was dieser Forderung als Kern zu Grund liegt, ist aber durchaus nicht eine neuzeitliche Erfindung, sintemal die sozialen Aufgaben der Kirche schon längst vor der jetzigen Generation gepredigt und praktisch ausgeübt sind. Rückwärts blickend weisen wir nur hin auf das Buch des seligen Hofpredigers Adolf Stoecker in Berlin, „Christlich Sozial" und auf sein eminent soziales Wirken in der Arbeit der Inneren Mission und besonders in der Berliner Stadtmission in den achtziger und neunziger Jahren des letzten Jahrhunderts. Wohlverstanden, der deutsche Begriff der Inneren Mission ist ein absolut verschiedener von dem, was wir „Innere Mission" als synodalen Arbeitszweig nennen. Während bei uns bis in allerneuste Zeit die Innere Mission sich hauptsächlich mit der Errichtung und Pflege neuer Gemeinden befaßte, ist die deutsche Innere Mission in erster Linie eine tatkräftige Pflege der entkirchlichten Individuen gewesen, also daß die amerikanische Innere Mission ein weit mehr soziales Gepräge als die deutsche individualistische Innere Mission hat.

Weiter rückwärts war Hermann August Francke ein hervorragend sozial wirkender Mann. Luther und seine Mitarbeiter in der Reformation hatten bei aller Betonung der individualistischen Einstellung des Evangeliums doch auch sehr stark soziale Züge. Ich brauche nicht auf Calvin hinzuweisen, weil dessen soziales Wirken in Genf ja allgemein bekannt ist. Ich erinnere nur daran, daß Dr. Luther eine Schrift schrieb: „Ordnung eines gemeinen Kastens" (wir würden heutzutage sagen: „Community Fund") und „An die Ratsherren aller Städte deutschen Landes, daß sie christliche Schulen aufrichten und halten sollen." Selbst in der katholischen Kirche vor der Reformation haben wir so manche Ereignisse, die wir als Versuche ansprechen dürfen, der sozialen Seite des Evangeliums zu ihrem Recht zu verhelfen. Die Gründung von Mönchsklöstern in bekehrten Landstrichen war entschieden eine soziale Tat, da diese Anstalten nicht nur Wächterinnen über den reinen Glauben, nicht nur Pflanzstätten der Gelehrsamkeit waren, sondern auch Lehrstätten und Musterschulen des Ackerbaus und Gewerbes. Ja, die Gründung von Mönchsorden überhaupt ist ein Versuch, die sozialen Ideale des Evangeliums nach der derzeitigen, freilich nach unsrer Ansicht falschen, Auffassung des Christentums zu verwirklichen. Man sieht also, daß die Forderung nach einem sozialen Wirken der Kirche uralt ist.

Neu ist nur der Name, die Prägung des Schlagwortes, die wir Professor Walter Rauschenbusch vom theologischen Seminar in

Rochester, N. Y., verdanken. Neu ist auch die Begründung für diese Forderung. Neu ist ferner die Ausdehnung, welche diese Forderung angenommen hat. Sie erstreckt sich von der blöden Forderung der „Zielbewußten," daß die ganze christliche Kirche in toto, also als Ganzes der sozialistischen Partei beitreten solle, bis zu allerlei unklaren und verschwommenen sozialistischen Forderungen. Man hält eben die beiden von Grund aus verschiedenen Begriffe sozial und sozialistisch nicht auseinander. So muß naturgemäß allerlei Unklarheit entstehen. Diese Unklarheit aber über das, was man unter dem Namen „soziales" Evangelium zu verstehen hat, ist die Ursache davon, daß es so viele Gegner hat, die da sagen, daß die Rettung der Seelen, nicht der Leiber, des Individuums, nicht der Allgemeinheit die Hauptsache im Christentum sei. Sie weisen darauf hin, daß die Allgemeinheit sich doch aus Einzelexistenzn zusammensetze, und daß man dem gemeinen Wesen, der Gesellschaft, nicht helfen könne, wenn man darüber die Einzelpersonen vernachlässige. Und doch hat die Forderung nach einer sozialen Auswirkung des Christentums ihr völlig begründetes, gutes Recht.

Zur Begründung dieses Rechtes müssen wir allerdings zunächst einige Schranken aufrichten. Die Kirche Jesu Christi ist nicht wie Pallas Athene in voller Waffenrüstung dem Haupt ihres Vaters entsprungen. Vielmehr ist sie ein Produkt der historischen Entwickelung; sie ist, mehr oder minder bewußt, beeinflußt von den jemaligen Zeitströmungen. Wer wollte es bezweifeln, daß der Entwicklungsgang der Kirche ein ganz andrer gewesen wäre, wenn Christus und seine Jünger, und besonders sein größter Apostel, Paulus, Römer und nicht Hebräer gewesen wären, wenn die älteste Kirche sich nicht hätte sofort mit den hellenischen Lebensidealen auseinandersetzen müssen. Oder können wir uns Gethsemane vorstellen, wenn die Elf deutsche Krieger anstatt hebräischer kleiner Leute gewesen wären? Wir dürfen eben einmal nicht außer Acht lassen, wie viel der Einfluß der helleniſtischen Philosophie, wie sehr der erbitterte Geisteskampf mit den Gnostikern dazu beigetragen hat, die Kirche in Bahnen zu lenken, die vielleicht durchaus nicht nach dem Sinn eines Matthäus, eines Petrus gewesen wären. Allein die unbefangene Betrachtung des Evangeliums Johannis in Vergleich mit den synoptischen Zeugen Jesu zeigt uns, wie viele verschiedene Strömungen neben einander und gleichzeitig in der Kirche Platz gefunden haben.

Jedes Jahrhundert der Kirche trägt seine besondre Signatur. War das neunzehnte Jahrhundert, nach dem Erwachen aus dem Geistesschlaf des Rationalismus, hauptsächlich gekennzeichnet durch eine lebendige Frömmigkeit und deren Auswirkung in der Arbeit der Heidenmission, so ließ das reißend schnelle Anwachsen des Mar-

rismus das Pendel nach der entgegengesetzten Seite hinüberschwingen und ließ in der Kirche mehr Nachdruck auf die inneren Aufgaben derselben legen. Man sah die Gefahr, die in dem Ansturm des atheistischen Proletariats gegen alle Autorität, menschliche wie göttliche, lag, und sah sich nach einem Heilmittel um. Was Wunder, daß man die Kirche in das Joch des Antisozialismus zu spannen versuchte? Der uralte Schrei der Rechtlosen und Bedrückten: „Die Kirche macht uns nicht satt. Was soll uns die Kirche?“ wurde beantwortet mit dem Hinweis auf die sozialen Aufgaben der Kirche. Aber damit wurden oft, sehr oft, der Kirche Dinge zugemutet, die weit außerhalb ihres von Gott gesetzten Rahmens lagen. Ich erinnere um die Zeit des Weltkrieges, in der uns von allen Seiten entgegen posaunt wurde: „Die Kirche hat versagt,“ weil sie dem Massenmorden kein Ende bereiten konnte. Gewiß hatte die Kirche auch im Weltkrieg ihre soziale Aufgabe, aber diese lag nicht in der aktiven Einmischung in das Gebiet des weltlichen Staates. Summa summarum: **Die aktuellen Zeitereignisse und Geistesströmungen können wohl zur positiven Definition der augenblicklichen sozialen Aufgaben der Kirche dienen, aber nimmermehr zur thematischen Begründung dieser Anforderungen.**

Ebensowenig aber dürfen wir die Begründung der sozialen Aufgabe der Kirche aus dem Alten Testament herleiten. Darin erblicke ich das „proton pseudos,“ den fundamentalen Irrtum von Professor Rauschenbusch, daß er den Heiland einfach auf der Basis des sozialen Programms der alttestamentlichen Propheten weiter bauen läßt, wenn er auch zugibt, daß Christus nicht in den althergebrachten Geleisen weiter gegangen ist, sondern daß er die Hoffnungen und Erwartungen des Volkes in ganz andre Bahnen gelenkt habe. Wir halten vielmehr dafür, daß mit Jesu etwas **absolut** Neues in die Erscheinung getreten ist, etwas, das im tiefsten Wesen von der prophetischen Verkündigung des Alten Testaments verschieden ist. Ein Beispiel für viele: Die Bezeichnung Gottes als des Vaters ist im Alten Testament freilich schon vorhanden. Aber von dem ersten Gebrauch dieses Terminus, Deut. 32, 6, bis zum letzten, Mal. 2, 10, finden wir die Bezeichnung immer nur als eine kollektivistische, das ganze Volk Israel einschließende. In den wenigen Stellen, wo die Vaterschaft Gottes auf eine Einzelperson bezogen wird, ist es stets nur im Mund Gottes, nie eines einzelnen Menschen, als eine Verheißung auf zukünftige, messianische Zeit und dann auch nur für den verheißenen Davidssohn. Wie anders dagegen im Neuen Testament! Allein das Herrengebet, das Unser Vater, zeigt, wie absolut verschieden die Einstellung des Neuen Bundes ist. Gerade gegenüber dem sozialen, kollektiven Anschauungsbegriff des Alten Testaments ist das Neue Testament durchaus subjektiv. Gerade darin ist das Neue

enthalten, das den Neuen Bund gegenüber dem Alten kennzeichnet, daß die Religion den Fortschritt vom sozialen zum individuellen, vom nationalen zum universalen Verhältnis zu Gott macht. Darum lehnen wir jede Begründung des sozialen Inhaltes des Evangeliums ab, die sich auf das Alte Testament stützt.

Vielmehr weisen wir prinzipielle Beweiskraft für den sozialen Inhalt des Evangeliums nur dem Neuen Testament zu und zwar in erster Linie den Worten des Heilandes selber. Können wir aus seinen „ipsissima verba" die soziale Tendenz oder den sozialen Inhalt des Evangeliums beweisen, haben wir unsre Aufgabe gelöst und das gute Recht des sozialen Christentums nachgewiesen. Sind wir aber anderseits dazu nicht imstande, so nützt uns alles Herumreden und Argumentieren nichts, dann ist eben das Christentum **nicht** sozial. Jedoch, man möchte einwenden, daß der Herr allerdings sozial gesinnt gewesen, daß aber in seinen erhaltenen Worten leider keins sei, das diese soziale Gesinnung unwiderleglich beweise. Um diesem Argumente entgegenzukommen, lassen wir in zweiter Linie, mit sekundärer Beweiskraft, die Worte der Apostel zu, wie sie uns in den kanonischen Büchern des Neuen Testaments erhalten sind. Wenn irgend jemand, so sollten die drei Apostel des innersten Kreises, Johannes, Petrus und Jakobus Jesu Sinnesart und Lehre gekannt haben. Von allen dreien haben wir aber glücklicherweise Briefe erhalten. Auch Paulus dürfen wir getrost unter die Zahl der vollgültigen Zeugen rechnen, wenn er auch zu Jesu Lebzeiten kein Apostel gewesen ist. Die Briefe dieser Apostel sind aber unter so verschiedenen sozialen Verhältnissen geschrieben, die Empfänger in so verschiedenen sozialen Lagen zu suchen, daß irgendwie und irgendwo die soziale Anschauung des Meisters zu Tage treten mußte. Wir machen aber hier wieder die Einschränkung, daß, falls Aussprüche in der epistolischen Literatur vorkommen sollten, die den Jesusworten der Evangelien widersprechen, wir den Evangelien den Vorrang einräumen, ungeachtet der Tatsache, daß die Briefe durchschnittlich älter sind als die Evangelien in ihrer jetzigen Gestalt. Es ist leider eine Tatsache, die auch in den Evangelien zugegeben wird, daß die Jünger den Herrn oft gar nicht und oft falsch verstanden haben.

Wenden wir uns also zur Lehre Jesu Christi.

Bevor wir aber auch nur einen Schritt weiter gehen, müssen wir zuallererst feststellen, daß Jesus kein Sozialist war, auch kein sozialer Reformator. Darin stimmen alle Theologen, die über dieses Thema geschrieben haben, im weitesten Umfang überein. (Vergleiche Rauschenbusch: „Christianity and the Social Crisis"; Shailer Matthews: „Jesus on Social Institutions.") Mit Recht sagt Rauschenbusch: „Sociology and political economy were just as far outside of his range of thought as organic chemistry etc." (l. c.,

p. 47.) Wohl knüpft Jesus an die messianischen, sozialen Hoffnungen des Volkes seiner Zeit an, aber er gibt ihnen sofort einen ganz andern Gedankeninhalt. Israels Hoffnung war der Messias und mit ihm das Kommen seines Reiches. Seine Erwartung war national, und da das nationale Leben unter der Herrschaft Roms vernichtet war, eine Auflehnung gegen Rom, eine mit Waffengewalt siegreich durchgeführte Revolution gegen das Imperium.

Den Ausdruck „Reich Gottes" nimmt Jesus aus der messianischen Erwartung Israels auf. Aber das ist auch alles. Der Begriff, den der Herr damit verbindet, ist ein absolut andrer. Ich glaube, unser neuer Katechismus hat den Sinn Christi recht wohl erfaßt, wenn er das Reich Gottes definiert: „The kingdom of God is the rule of God established in the hearts and lives of men." (qu. 93.) Auch Shailer Matthews sagt sehr korrekt: „He emphasized not the acquisition of rights, but the attitude of mind that leads to the sharing of rights." Wir wissen ja, daß Jesu Lehre durchaus altruistisch ist. Die Welt aber ist egoistisch. In seinem Kampf gegen die Welt muß Jesus daher die Buße; (vgl. Matth. 4, 17) d. h. eine Aenderung der Geisteseinstellung der Seinen verlangen. Nicht das eigene „Ich" soll das höchste Gebot und die bewegende Triebkraft des Christen sein, sondern das „Nicht-Ich." Die zwei Gebote Jesu, Gott über alles zu lieben und den Nächsten gleich sich selbst, sind der klassische Ausdruck dieser Forderung. Jesus hat keine festgefügte Organisation erbaut und hinterlassen, sondern nur Richtlinien der Geisteseinstellung. Daß nun infolge seiner Betonung der Nächstenliebe eine soziale Richtung der Christen vorhanden ist, d. h. eine solche, die Christum, sein Reich, seine Kirche, ja die ganze Mitmenschheit als höchstes Gut ansieht, ist wohl selbstverständlich nach dem bisher Gesagten. Aber nur so weit und nicht weiter gehen Jesu Befehle an seine Jünger. Es hat dem Heiland durchaus fern gelegen, irgendwelche soziale Vorschriften und Gesetze aufstellen zu wollen. Wieder möchte ich Shailer Matthews zitieren: „Specific social teachings of Jesus, in so far as they exist, are to be regarded as the expression of what would be true in case the attitude of love were realized." (1. c., p. 63.)

Ueberhaupt dürfen wir ja nicht vergessen, daß Jesu Lehre vom Reich Gottes nicht politisch, sondern eschatologisch ist. Jedenfalls haben seine Apostel und Jünger den Herrn so verstanden und aufgefaßt. Das ganze Neue Testament ist durchdrungen von der Erwartung des in allernächster Zeit zu erwartenden Wiederkommens Christi und damit des Eintretens des Gottesreiches in die Wirklichkeit. Ob sich diese Zukunftshoffnung der ersten Jüngerschar auf ein irrtümliches Verständnis eines Herrenwortes begründet, das wir in Matth. 16, 28; Mark. 9, 1; Luk. 9, 27 nach dem Verständnis der Jünger aufgezeichnet finden, lassen wir dahingestellt

sein. Jedenfalls war ihnen das Wort wichtig genug, daß alle drei Synoptiker es in ihre Verkündigung aufnahmen. Es läßt sich jedoch aus andern Herrenworten, die wir der Raumersparnis halber nicht aufführen, mit Sicherheit feststellen, daß Jesu Lehre nicht darauf hinausging, das Reich Gottes aktiv oder gewaltsam herbeizuführen, sondern daß seine Absicht war, die Seinen so vorzubereiten, daß sie an diesem Reich teilhaben konnten. Die gewaltige Krise, durch welche das Christentum gegen das Ende des ersten und im ganzen zweiten Jahrhundert hindurchging, läßt sich nicht anders erklären, als daß im antignostischen Kampf die Kirche die Umstellung von der eschatologischen Hoffnung zur politisch sozialpraktischen Organisation vollzog. Es hieße, Eulen nach Athen tragen, wenn wir den Beweis antreten wollten, daß die Episteln des Neuen Testaments die Parusie in der allernächsten Zukunft erwarteten.

Dementsprechend finden wir im Neuen Testament keine sozialen Vorschriften Jesu, die für alle Zeiten und alle Verhältnisse allgemein bindende Geltungskraft hätten. Einige Beispiele: Jesus hat keine Anweisungen über das Geld gegeben, wohl Richtlinien darüber, was der Besitz für den Menschen zu bedeuten hat, weil er eine trennende Scheidelinie zwischen den verschiedenen Strata der Gesellschaft bildet und darum als „ungerechter Mammon" zu betrachten ist, aber bestimmt ausgeführte Gesetze darüber hat er nicht gegeben. Wir wollen nicht auf das Beispiel des reichen Jünglings eingehen, weil wir Jesu Rat an den jungen Mann, alles zu verkaufen und den Armen zu geben, nur für eine Prüfung in diesem einen, konkreten Fall ansehen und nicht für allgemein giltige Regel. Allgemein gültig ist an diesem Ereignis nur die sozialsittliche Forderung, das Herz nicht an den Mammon zu hängen. Wie weit der Herr davon entfernt ist mit Absicht und Bedacht sozial wirken zu wollen, zeigt uns gleich anfangs der von der ersten christlichen Gemeinde gemachte Versuch, einen praktischen Kommunismus einzurichten. Die Geschichte des Ananias ist durchaus nicht ein Beweis für den biblischen Kommunismus, sondern gegen ihn. Die Strafe trat nicht deswegen ein, weil Ananias nicht allen seinen Besitz hergab, sondern nur wegen seiner Lüge. Ebenso sind die Klostergelübde des Mittelalters über den Privatbesitz ein kümmerlicher Fehlschlag in dem Bestreben, den Sinn Jesu Christi auszudrücken.

Eine andre zu der damaligen Zeit brennende soziale Frage ist die Frage nach dem Verhältnis der Sklaverei zum Gottesreich. Wir finden aber von unserm Erlöser kein einziges Sterbenswörtchen darüber. Auch Paulus tritt zu unsrer Verwunderung in 1. Kor. 7, 21 gegen das Streben der Sklaven nach politischer Freiheit auf. (Vergleiche Bachmann: Der erste Brief Pauli an die Korinther, 1905, S. 287 f.)

Eheleben und Ehescheidung sind gewiß soziale Fragen von der höchsten Wichtigkeit; dennoch gibt Jesus keine Vorschriften über diese Fragen, sondern nur Anweisungen. Er verweist auf das bestehende mosaische Gesetz. Was darüber hinausgeht, sind Anweisungen, wie sich seine Jünger verhalten sollten, wenn das Reich Gottes komme, oder wie sie sich verhalten sollten, damit sie für das Kommen des Reiches vorbereitet wären. Er will nur von einer Scheidung auf Grund des Ehebruches wissen. Das stellen wir in dieselbe Linie mit der Anweisung Jesu über den Eid (Matth. 5, 34), die wir auch nicht „verbatenus" und unter allen Umständen als geltend betrachten können (Jesus hat selber geschworen, vgl. Matth. 26, 63—64), sondern nur als Hinweis auf das kommende Reich Gottes. Im Reich Gottes wird man keinen Eid schwören, in ihm werden keine Ehen geschieden werden. Um also das Kommen des Reiches zu ermöglichen, um bereit zu sein, wenn es in den letzten Tagen kommen wird, deshalb gibt der Herr diese Richtlinien, nicht als Gesetzeskodex für die bestehenden Zeitläufte.

Zusammenfassend also finden wir in Jesu Lehren und der Verkündigung seiner Apostel keinerlei soziale Vorschriften. Dennoch aber, sagen wir, hat das „soziale" Christentum sein vollkommenes, biblisch begründetes Recht. Natürlich kann keine politische Partei, kein Sozialismus, kein Kommunismus, kein sozialökonomischer Bruchteil der Gesellschaft Jesum als den Seinen in Anspruch nehmen, weder der Arbeitgeber, der Kapitalist, noch der Arbeitnehmer, der Proletarier. Das lehnen wir von vornherein und mit aller Entschiedenheit ab. Ebenso müssen wir es unumwunden verneinen, wenn alle kirchliche, sagen wir nur gerade heraus, alle synodale Tätigkeit unter den Gesichtspunkt der sozialen Auswirkung des Evangeliums auf die Gesellschaft gestellt werden soll. Das soziale Element ist *nie* die Hauptsache des Christentums gewesen und darf es auch nicht werden. Der Hauptpunkt alles universal- wie partikulär-kirchlichen Wirkens muß das sein und bleiben, daß des Menschen Sohn gekommen ist, zu suchen und selig zu machen, was verloren ist.

Dennoch, wiederholen wir, hat das „soziale" Evangelium sein unbestreitbares, gutes Recht. Es mag die Stadt, die auf dem Berg liegt, nicht verborgen bleiben. Wir leiten das gute Recht des sozialen Christentums ab aus den beiden Forderungen des Herrn an seine Jünger, Licht und Salz der Erde zu sein. Verbinden wir mit diesen beiden Forderungen die beiden Gebote, an denen, nach Christi Erklärung, das ganze Gesetz und die Propheten hängt, so ergibt sich ohne alles weitere Argumentieren von selbst der Schluß, daß die Licht-und-Salz-Eigenschaft des Christentums sich in allererster Linie an diesen beiden Geboten auswirken muß und an ihnen in die Erscheinung treten muß. Das muß ja jeder

sofort zugeben, daß eine Liebe zu Gott, die sich ängstlich vor der Welt zu verstecken sucht, nicht das von Jesu geforderte Verhältnis zu Gott ist. Bei einer solchen angeblichen Liebe zu Gott wird es einmal nach Mark. 8, 38 gehen: Jesus wird sich eines solchen Jüngers auch schämen. Ebenso entschieden ist dann aber auch die zweite Forderung, die eine soziale Auswirkung des Christentums als eine unbedingt notwendige Folgerung der Nächstenliebe beansprucht. „If socialism be only ‚acknowledgment of brotherhood and fellowship in work' it is but a phase of Christianity." Setzen wir für „socialism" das Wort „soziales Christentum," so muß sich jeder Christ ohne Weiteres dazu bekennen. Ein soziales Wirken des Christentums ist nichts als eine logische Konsequenz des Glaubens überhaupt. Ein Glaube ohne Werke ist tot. Ein Glaube, der den Mitmenschen in sozialer Notlage sieht und nicht helfend und rettend in die Bresche springt, ist ja gar kein Glaube.

Aber, wendet man ein, hat nicht Jesus zu Martha gesagt: „Du hast viel Sorge und Mühe. Eins aber ist not?" Wenn wir nun auch durchaus nicht abstreiten, daß das Eine, was not ist, das individualistische Sichversenken in des Meisters Lehre ist, so folgern wir doch weiter, daß, wenn die Prämisse not ist, dann auch die Konsequenz not sein muß. Und in der Tat, wer sich nicht selbst die Augen verklebt und die Ohren verstopft, der muß es sehen und hören, daß in dieser Zeit der sozialen Unrast, der schrecklichsten Notzustände, irgend etwas getan werden muß. Ich sage nicht, „sollte," sondern einfach, schlechthin und unbedingt „m u ß." Es besteht sonst die Gefahr, daß unser ganzes gesellschaftliches System über den Haufen geworfen wird. Man möchte mir erwidern, daß das auch gerade kein großer Schade wäre. Meinetwegen, aber „exampla docent": Mit dem Umsturz alles Bestehenden fällt auch die Kirche, das Christentum. Man vergleiche doch nur, wie es jetzt in den Sowjetstaaten aussieht. Will man das, nun gut, dann möge man nur wie bisher, „sit venia verbo," weiterwursteln. Wer aber ein Herz hat für seine Brüder, der muß miteinstimmen in den Notruf: Alle Mann an Deck! Nicht nur das Staatsschiff, das Schiff der Zivilisation, das Schiff der Kirche ist in Not. Wo ist die Arche Noahs, in der wir die Menschheit bergen können in der Sintflut des Materialismus, des Atheismus, des Mammonismus? Die Antwort lautet: **In einem tätigen, sozialen Christentum.**

Aber, rufen die Gegner wieder, das ist nicht durchführbar, die Hebung des sozialen Elends liegt nicht in der Aufgabe des Christentums, und selbst wenn die Kirche mit einem sozialen Programm Erfolg haben könnte, so ist es nicht ihre Aufgabe. Nun über das Letztere haben wir schon uns auseinandergesetzt und dargelegt, daß es absolut und unbedingt die wohlbegründete Aufgabe der Kirche ist, die Ausübung der christlichen Nächstenliebe praktisch zu gestalten.

Wir wenden uns hier nur gegen die erste Hälfte der These, daß nämlich eine soziale Arbeit der Kirche undurchführbar sei. Man erlaube uns, mit der Gegenfrage zu antworten: Warum? Wir wollen zugeben, daß mancherlei undurchführbare Utopien in den Gehirnen einzelner Fanatiker entsprungen sind, daß allerhand vage, uferlose Phantastereien uns als soziale Panaceen angepriesen worden sind, die doch bei dem Versuch der Verwirklichung nicht Stich halten. Aber „abusus non tollit usum." Ein soziales Programm der Kirche ist sehr wohl möglich und auch durchführbar.

Nur müssen zwei Forderungen gebührende Berücksichtigung finden. Zunächst darf sich die Kirche nie und unter keinen Umständen in die Sklavenketten einer Partei oder Richtung einspannen lassen. Charakterisieren wir die beiden hauptsächlichen Strata der Gesellschaft kurz als Arbeitgeber und Arbeitnehmer, so wäre es der schwerwiegendste Fehler, der begangen werden könnte, wenn sich die Kirche entweder ohne Weiteres auf die Seite des Kapitalismus stellen würde und der großen Menge der Arbeiter entgegenrufen: Seid zufrieden, wartet auf das Himmelreich; anderseits aber darf auch die Kirche sich nimmermehr von vornherein und ohne weiteres auf die andre Seite schlagen und den oberen Schichten der Gesellschaft die geballte schwielige Faust des Arbeiters zeigen. Die Kirche muß frei sein und bleiben, daß sie, wie Johannes, einem Herodes gegenüber treten kann: Es ist nicht Recht, daß du deines Bruders Weib habest. Aber ebenso muß sie wie derselbe Johannes, der großen Masse entgegenhalten können: „‚Contenti estote,' begnügt euch mit eurem Kommisbrote." Alle und jede Versuche, die Kirche auf eine bestimmte Parteirichtung festnageln zu wollen, müssen wir „a limine" zurückweisen als dem Geist Christi zuwider.

Sodann aber muß die Kirche ein bestimmtes, fest umrissenes Programm haben. Es ist in Wirklichkeit nicht die Aufgabe der Kirche, die ganze Sanierung der gesellschaftlichen Zustände allein zu übernehmen und durchzuführen. Neben ihr und über ihr steht in erster Linie die soziale Tätigkeit des Staates. Ihm fällt in erster Reihe die Aufgabe zu, für eine allen seinen Mitgliedern ertragbare soziale Gestaltung der Gesellschaftsordnung zu sorgen. Neben ihr und ihr gleichberechtigt stehen die sozialen Errungenschaften der Wissenschaft. Neben ihr und ihr untergeordnet stehen allerlei soziale Faktoren und Agenturen, die an ihrem Teil ohne Berührung mit der Kirche, es versuchen, das soziale Elend zu lindern. Die Kirche kann nicht und soll nicht mit allen diesen Faktoren in Wettbewerb oder Konkurrenz treten. Sie kann und soll sich bemühen, die in dritter Stelle genannten sozialen Elemente so zu beeinflussen, daß sie nicht ihrem eigenen Wesen und ihren eigenen Aufgaben hindernd in den Weg treten; aber hauptsächlich

und vor allen Dingen muß die Kirche selber ein bestimmtes, scharf umzogenes soziales Programm haben.

Damit fordern wir natürlich nicht, daß dieses Sozialprogramm der Kirche die Gestalt eines Dogmas annehme. Das sei ferne. Vielmehr muß sich das soziale Programm der Kirche nach den bestehenden Zeitläuften richten. Was heute unumgängliche Notwendigkeit ist, mag in hundert, oder vielleicht schon viel weniger Jahren, veraltet und überflüssig sein. Darum muß das Programm der Kirche ein fließendes sein. Aber es muß in einem bestimmten Flußbett fließen, nicht über alle Ufer hinaus sich verbreitend und damit verflachend. Es ist nicht die Aufgabe der Kirche, die soziale Gesetzgebung eines Landes zu übernehmen, sondern die „de facto" bestehenden Uebelstände zu lindern. In die Gesetzgebung greife die Kirche nur so weit ein, daß sie ihre warnende Stimme ertönen lasse, wenn unsoziale Gesetzvorschläge eingebracht werden. Dann allerdings hat sie das Recht, wie jeder Bürger, und die Pflicht als Botschafter an Christi statt, zu reden und zu stimmen, aber nicht zu handeln. Zu handeln hat sie nur dann, wann es sich handelt, als guter Samariter für den bedrängten Mitmenschen zu sorgen.

Es kann nicht im Rahmen dieses Aufsatzes liegen, dieses Programm der Kirche aufstellen zu wollen. Es wird in den Großstädten wie New York und Chicago, Philadelphia und Detroit ein fundamental verschiedenes sein von dem, was in ländlichen und kleinstädtischen Bezirken notwendig ist. Aber die Forderung muß klar und deutlich aufgestellt werden, daß die Kirche ein solches Programm habe. Es ist Sache der Synoden, der Konferenzen der Beamten mit den Delegierten der Kirchen ein solches Programm aufzustellen. Nur hüte man sich vor überschwänglichen Theorien, wie die schon zurückgewiesene Forderung, daß die ganze Kirche sich in „corpore" der sozialistischen Partei anschließe. Wir wiederholen unsre Forderung, daß die Kirche ein bestimmtes, fest umschriebenes Sozialprogramm haben soll, das von Zeit zu Zeit revidiert und mit den Fragen und Nöten des Tages in Einklang gebracht werden muß. Dieses Programm aber muß die Kirche dann auch mit allen ihr zur Verfügung stehenden Kräften durchführen.

Wir sind am Ende. Resumierend können wir nur noch einmal sagen: **Das soziale Evangelium ist wohl nicht die, wohl aber eine Aufgabe der christlichen Kirche.** Auf unsre eigene Synode angewandt, ergibt sich die Forderung, daß nicht alle Tätigkeit derselben ausschließlich unter das Licht der sozialen Wirkung gestellt werde. Auch für unsre Kirche gilt es: Man sollte das eine, die Predigt des individualistischen Evangeliums, tun und das andre, die sozialen Konsequenzen dieser Verkündigung, nicht lassen.

EDITORIALS

THE SIXTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE

On the first of January, 1873, appeared the first number of the "Theologische Zeitschrift," the predecessor of "the Theological Magazine." With the present number, therefore, the theological organ of our Synod rounds out the sixtieth year of its existence. It seems appropriate to take due cognizance of this fact.

At the General Conference of 1872, held at Quincy, Ill., our church body, the "Evangelical Synod of the West," united with the "Synod of the Northwest" and the "Synod of the East," taking the name of the "German Evangelical Synod of North America." That this step put new life into the Evangelical Synod is manifested by a number of things. What interests us here most is the fact that only a few months later the Synod began to issue the "Theologische Zeitschrift." When it is considered that even after the union the new body numbered only 276 pastors (see Mücke, "Geschichte, page 210) it seems most remarkable that such a small denomination would be ambitious enough to assume the risk of such a literary venture. The theological education of its pastors lay in the hands of the small faculty at Marthasville, a humble place, hidden away in the Missouri forests. Nearly all the ministers were engaged in the hard struggle of eking out a bare living, at the same time doing their best towards meeting the practical needs of a young church in a new land. Still, they did not forget that it is not enough for a minister to be able to expound a text. They came from a land where the minister is not a preacher or pastor only, but also, if at all possible, a little bit of a theologian. At any rate, they knew that their fatherland boasted a noble tradition of theological achievement. They knew that there was no land under the sun that had produced such a wealth of thinkers and leaders in the theological field. So the "Theologische Zeitschrift" was started. There were plenty of theological papers in the old country which they might have subscribed to. But they wanted one of their own, in part because it would adapt itself to their own needs and in part because it would give their own ministers a chance to try their own wings, to ask their own questions and seek their own answers.

It must be admitted that the sledding was rough and the success doubtful, for years. In the first decade the paper had four

editors. One of them was Professor E. Otto. He would have been an ideal man for the place, one would think, but he had gone through the critical school of Bible study, was somewhat of a "higher critic" himself. In the Old Testament he found many "pictorial" representations, which others took literally. So he resigned (in 1880) after only two years of editorship. Today his theological position would be called very moderate. In 1880 he was ahead of his time.

In 1883 *Professor W. Becker* became editor and retained this place for sixteen years. Becker was not only a scholar, he also had considerable influence in the Synod and at its District and General Conferences. We heard him at the last General Conference he attended, that of Pittsburgh, in 1917 (he died in 1919). His keen, analytical mind enabled him to engage in brilliant debates on constitutional and other questions. He was not a popular speaker or writer. Still he was regarded as an authority and belonged decidedly among the leading men of the Synod. In the "Zeitschrift" one of his pet hobbies was a tussle with the "Missourians." Born in Baden where confessional controversies had long been unknown, he found it hard to be tolerant to Lutheran intolerance and if one looked through the pages of the paper under his guidance, one would often find him in shining armor, waging a valiant combat against the old foe.

Naturally the paper grew in circulation with the growing Synod. But it was uphill work. Oftentimes there were no contributions or not enough of them, then again its choice of subjects was criticized. The interest of many was lukewarm, and certainly the paper was never a paying adventure. So it was doubtless with a sense of relief that Professor Becker, in 1898, handed over the editorial work to Rev. Louis Haas. The General Conference had changed the name of the paper to "Magazin für Evangelische Thelogie und Kirche." The new editor had received his training in the "Mission House" at Basel. In erudition and scholarly ability he was well qualified to compete with any university graduate. He greatly revered his former teacher Gess and would often pay tribute to his memory. The German part of the readers of the paper adhered faithfully to the "Magazin" that had now established itself well with its constituency. Still one could feel that the trend of the time would soon demand some recognition in the matter of language.

Rev. Haas had in the last years of his life removed to Spokane, Wash. He labored to the end, dying in 1917, seventy-three years of age.

The present editor succeeded to his place in 1917. The country was at war with Germany, the "fatherland," and it was a very

delicate task to stay true to one's convictions without incurring the penalties of the "espionage act." Even when peace was restored it became necessary for quite a while to step warily.

The language question grew more and more insistent. How were we to get the cooperation of the younger clergy who had little knowledge of, and use for, the German? The future belonged to the young; if we were to have a future for the Magazine we had to have the favor of the younger set. So it was finally decided to give the English first place in our paper and its name was again changed to "The Theological Magazine of the Evangelical Synod."

We also realized that this step in itself did not meet all the demands of the time. The interests of our readers and, therefore, of the Magazine, in the past had been theological chiefly. It had been devoted to the range of subjects which are contained in the three articles of the "Apostolic Creed." The new emphasis, on the other hand, was on Christian Ethics; on the salvation of society, not on individual salvation only. The "Kingdom of God" was becoming the great battle cry. Sociology was taking the place of theology in the narrower sense. Such sciences as the comparative study of Religions, Philosophy of Religion, Psychology, etc., were given new attention. The Theory of Evolution, so much more in the foreground here than in German theology, called for its share of attention.

To all this we have tried to give consideration so far as our ability and that of our contributors allowed. Just now the matter of Christian Education assumes more of importance. We know our limitations very well. We need the cooperation of our brethren. We should regret it exceedingly if their support and continuing favor were withheld. We ask for the love and loyalty of our constituency as a whole and for the helping hands of those who feel that they want to contribute directly to the success of our cause. It is, perhaps, too much to expect from individuals a personal and real propaganda; but could such a hope and dream be realized the welfare and future of our paper would be secure indeed.

THE SECRET OF SUCCESS

A short while ago we atended a church anniversary in one of our country congregations. It was for us a delightful experience. The calm and restful atmosphere of the country is a balm to the mind and body of the city-dweller. Besides, the church is no uncertain quantity in the farmer's life. There were three services on that day and at each one of them was the church—a large and commodious building—well filled. The minister, a young man of perhaps thirty-two, has been with that congregation about six or

seven years and only a year ago the church was renovated at a very large expense.

Our personal discussions naturally turned in the direction of the old and yet ever new question of the minister's success. That young brother voiced the opinion that the chief factor was not a man's intellectual equipment but the kind of man he was. He said that he himself did not make any particular claims of scholarship or eloquence in the pulpit, but that if he had had some measure of success in his ministerial career, he ascribed it to the fact that he had cultivated the personal qualifications. A minister's personality was in his estimate by far the greatest factor in a successful ministry.

While listening to the brother's "footnotes to pastoral theology" we made some mental qualifications, but on the whole we felt that the weight of evidence was overwhelmingly on his side. It may not always have been so. When the minister was regarded as the keeper of the mysteries of the kingdom, in the times of our theocratic past, his personality was not of such decisive importance. His preaching power, his hold on Scripture truth, his moral and spiritual qualities were the things that counted. Jonathan Edwards may personally have been a man of pleasing ways but his success was not derived from that. He was influential in his time and is noted in church history because he could hold his audience over the burning pit with such dreadful earnestness that they felt themselves in "the hands of an angry God" and cried for mercy. And there is an even greater one than he was, John Calvin of Geneva. If ever man was far from having a pleasing personality, it was John Calvin. One only has to look at his picture, in that austere garb of his times, and one is sure that that man never laughed in his life. By the way, speaking of pictures, in certain churches and vestries one can survey long lines of ministers of the past and one will find that they are all men of serious mien and forbidding aspect. Take, on the other hand, the picture of a minister of today and with a sixteen to one probability you find him wearing the "smile that won't come off." However, let us not make the mistake of thinking that our forbears couldn't appreciate the blessedness of a cheerful countenance. Here is our Luther, who bore upon his shoulders a responsibility that ten others would not have been equal to. Wasn't he possessed of a pleasing personality? Did not he have a great sense of humor ? And if his personality had a much wider and more spontaneous appeal was it not because he had cultivated in himself an understanding of what makes life rich and joyful and healthy?

If one wants to be impressed with the fact that today personality is the thing that stands highest in the market, let him read the recent book by William S. Walsh, "Cultivating Personality."

The author, a psychiatrist, shows that, aside from scientific and related fields, substantial success in life is not dependent on brain power but that a man with a winning personality has a better chance than a man with a brilliant mind but unpleasant characteristics. This holds true in nearly all works of life, in public life, especially. Governor Roosevelt, in the last campaign, was in important respects inferior to President Hoover but he had a more pleasing personality and that helped him greatly against his opponent, who hated to face the crowd and to extend the glad hand.

The book by Walsh offers constructive counsel as to how to acquire and cultivate the right kind of personality. The minister will learn from it for he needs an attractive personality. But he will have to be on his guard against expecting too much from it. He should try hard to make himself popular but strive still harder to please God even at the expense of losing the favor of the people.

Immer heiter — Gott hilft weiter!

Vor einiger Zeit fiel uns ein altes „Pilgerbuch" in die Hände, ein Buch, in dem die Gäste, die durch unser Haus gegangen waren, sich eingezeichnet hatten samt einem kurzen, passenden Wort oder Vers. Als wir darin blätterten, stießen wir auf eine Seite, die nur eine ganz kurze und fast unleserliche Eintragung enthielt. Es stand daselbst das obige Wort: Immer heiter — Gott hilft weiter! Und darunter: Eduard.

Lebhaft waren die Erinnerungen, die dies Blatt in uns wachriefen. Vor etwa 30 Jahren kam ein alter Herr durch unser Haus, dessen aristokratisches Aeußere gar wenig zu seiner Beschäftigung paßte: Er verkaufte nämlich deutsche Bücher. Aber noch auffälliger war die Tatsache, daß er sein Augenlicht völlig verloren hatte. Kein Wunder, daß wir das größte Interesse an dem Mann nahmen und ihn einluden, bei uns eine Zeitlang zu verweilen. In den Abendstunden ließ er uns einen Blick tun in seine Lebensgeschichte.

Er sei, sagte er uns, der Sohn eines deutschen Generals und Festungskommandanten. Aus irgendeinm Grund — er sprach sich darüber nicht aus — sah er sich gezwungen, das alte Vaterland zu verlassen und nach Amerika auszuwandern. Er vertauschte seinen Namen — den einer bekannten Adelsfamilie — mit einem einfachen und nichtssagenden „Wilhelm." Jedenfalls war in seiner Lebensgeschichte ein Kapitel, das er Grund hatte, mit Stillschweigen zu übergehen.

Aber wenn dasselbe einen Fehltritt enthielt, der ihn tief demütigte — schwer waren auch die Lebensführungen, die ihm hier beschieden waren.

Nach mancherlei Schicksalswechseln erhielt er eine Stelle an einem College in Jowa. Er heiratete eine Frau, die ihn glücklich machte. Aber nun traf ihn ein schwerer Schlag. Sein Augenlicht fing an nachzulassen. Er sah sich mit Blindheit bedroht. Dann starb seine Frau — und da stand er allein, ohne Mittel, ohne Stellung, ein Mann von bald 70 Jahren, bald völlig erblindet. Brach er nun zusammen unter der Wucht solch unerhörter Schicksalsschläge?

„Nein," sagte er zu uns, „ich erinnerte mich, daß ich der Sohn eines alten Militärs sei, daß ich aus einer Familie stamme, die seit Generationen Tapferkeit und Mannesmut als ihre besonderen Eigenschaften gepflegt hatte." Er faßte den Plan, sich durch Bücherverkauf seinen Lebensunetrhalt zu verdienen. Blind, wie er war, begab er sich auf die Reise. Wenn er in eine Stadt kam, tappte er seinen Weg so gut als möglich zu einem deutschen Pastor oder einer deutschen Zeitungsoffice und ließ sich einen Mann geben, der ihn durch die Straßen führte zu den Adressen, die ihm Pastor oder Zeitungsmann gegeben hatte. Als er zu uns kam, war er 72 Jahre alt. Die Tapferkeit dieses schwerheimgesuchten Mannes und seine stramme militärische Haltung machten auf uns einen unvergeßlichen Eindruck.

Worin lag nun seine sittliche Kraft, sein heldenhafter Sinn? Wer die kurze, oben geschilderte Eintragung las, der mußte denken, es sei sein Gottvertrauen gewesen. Wir wollen auch gewiß nicht bestreiten, daß sein religiöser Glaube mit dazu betrug, ihn aufrecht zu erhalten. Aber die eigentliche Quelle seines mannhaften Durchhaltens war die Familientradition und das militärische Ideal, das er von dorther überkommen hatte. Es gibt auch sonst tapfere Seelen, die gar nicht mal den Anspruch machen, an einen Gott zu glauben, den man in der Not anruft, und der uns aus der Not heraus hilft. Wir alle kennen das poetische Selbstbekenntnis jenes Schwindsüchtigen, der kühn ausruft:

"I am the captain of my soul,
I am the master of my fate!"

Und wir alle erinnern uns, bei B. Russell gelesen zu haben, daß zwar der Verlust des Gottesglaubens uns das Licht des Daseins nimmt, daß aber dennoch die mannhafte Seele sich rüsten kann to *unyielding* despair! Am schroffesten weist Nietzsche allen Rest von Gottesverehrung von sich, wenn er die Moral des Christen eine Sklavenmoral nennt und den „Uebermenschen" alle Kraft aus sich selbst nehmen läßt.

Es ist wahr, daß manche, die sich nicht Christen nennen, oft ihre Schicksalsnöte mit mehr Geduld tragen als solche, die für sich den Christennamen beanspruchen. Es ist auch wahr, daß mit man-

chen Weltmenschen besser umgehen ist, als mit wunderlichen oder tadelsüchtigen Heiligen. Aber man muß nicht den Wert des Christenglaubens messen an den Schwächen seiner Bekenner. Sie bleiben oft weit zurück hinter ihren Bekenntnissen, aber würden sie nicht ohne Glauben noch unvollkommener sein?

Heutigen Tages leben wir in einer Zeit, wo für Millionen es nötig ist, sich mit Mannhaftigkeit zu rüsten und zu gleicher Zeit sich den Glauben an einen freundlichen Gott nicht schwinden zu lassen. Schreiber dieses sieht jeden Tag einen Mann auf dem Public Square stehen, in jedem Wetter, bei Regen, Wind und Kälte wie im Sonnenbrand. Er verkauft Zeitungen, trägt einen Gürtel, auf dem steht: I am blind! Er wohnt im Y. M. C. A. Von dort nimmt er wahrscheinlich seine religiöse Ausrüstung mit. Aber dann geht der achtundfünfzigjährige Mann an seine Stelle und ruft: Preß, Preß, Preß! Den ganzen Tag. Und man sieht ihn zuweilen lächeln. Er hat Glauben und hat Mannesmut! Was für ein Anblick! Viele, Tausende brauchen dieselbe Ausstattung. Die aber glücklicher gestellt sind, sollten sie nicht besonders dankbar sein und bereit, etwas Licht fallen zu lassen in das Dunkel, in dem andre dahergehen!

The Christian World

Congregationalist Is Called to Cleveland

DR CHESTER B. EMERSON ACCEPTS POST AT TRINITY CATHEDRAL; TO BECOME DEAN AFTER ORDINATION

Cleveland—The Rev. Chester Burge Emerson, D.D., prominent Congregational clergyman and pastor of the North Woodward Church, Detroit, has accepted a call to become residentiary canon and, eventually, dean of Trinity Cathedral here. Dr. Emerson was confirmed on November 5th by Bishop Page in Detroit, and was received as a candidate for holy orders in the diocese of Michigan. Until his ordination he will be licensed as a lay reader and authorized to minister in that capacity and to preach at the Cathedral.

Trinity Cathedral has been without a dean since November, 1931, when the Very Rev. Francis S. White, D.D., resigned to become rector of St. Andrew's Church, Tampa, Fla. The rules of the Cathedral provide that a dean be nominated to the chapter and executive committee by the Bishop. It is understood that a number of such recommendations were rejected for various reasons. Although not included in the original nominations Bishop Rogers intimated that Dr. Chester B. Emerson of the North Woodward Congregational Church, Detroit, had for some time been desirous of entering the Episcopal Church. After hearing Dr. Emerson the executice committee unanimously asked the Bishop to nominate him.

As Dr. Emerson is not in episcopal orders, it was impossible to elect him at once as dean of the Cathedral. It was therefore arranged that Bishop Rogers should become acting dean and Dr. Emerson appointed a lay reader, with title of canon in residence, a position that may, under Cathedral statutes, be held by a layman. It will be necessary for Dr. Emerson to remain a candidate for a minimum of six months before being ordained to the diaconate, and serve as deacon for another six months before he can be advanced to the priesthood and become dean.

Dr. Emerson has tendered his resignation as pastor of the Detroit church, the congregation of which will meet November 22d to act formally upon it. He expects to take up his work in Cleveland by January 1st.

WAS CLASSMATE OF BISHOP ROGERS

A classmate of Bishop Rogers at Union Theological Seminary when both men were students there, Dr. Emerson has attained a position of great prominence in the Congregational Church. He is a native of Massachusetts, having been born in Haverhill July 28, 1882, the son of John A. and Abbie Jane Emerson. He was graduated from Bowdoin

College in 1904 and from Union Seminary in 1909, receiving his doctorate in divinity from the former in 1919. He is unmarried. Ordained in the Congregational ministry in 1909, he served for four years as pastor of the first parish, Saco, Me., and in 1913 entered upon the pastorate of North Woodward Church, Detroit. During his ministry in this church, it has become the largest Congregational group in the country, outside of New York City, and is one of the largest of any religious body in Detroit.

Dr. Emerson has been a prominent figure in his denomination. He is chairman of the executive board of the Michigan Congregational Conference, a corporate member of the American Board of Foreign Missions, a member of the executive committee of the state board of Congregational Churches, and president of the board of trustees of the Michigan Conference since 1919. He was moderator of the state conference in 1925 and is a member of the executive committee on missions of the national council of Congregational Churches. Last year he was president of the Detroit Pastors' Union and he is now president of the Detroit Council of Churches.

ACTIVE IN CIVIC AFFAIRS

Dr. Emerson has taken an active part in civic and cultural affairs as well as in the religious field. He is a member of the Founders Society of the Art Museum of Detroit and a member of the board of directors of the Detroit Symphony Orchestra. He was a trustee of the Civic Theater.

Dr. Emerson served under the Y. M. C. A. in France from 1917-18; was chaplain of General Hospital No. 36. He is an overseer of Bowdoin College, a member of the board of directors of Union Theological Seminary, a trustee of Hampton Institute and Oliver College, and a member of Alpha Delta Phi fraternity.

On Wild Jackasses, Fool Voters and Prosperity

Everywhere in the United States, from Democrats and Republicans, we have a great chorus of tributes to Herbert Hoover. Part of it is pity, but most of it comes from an innate sense of decency and fair play. We had rather have men fair during a campaign, but if that is not yet possible in our present stage of development, it is something to find them disposed to be fair when the contest is over.

Practically everybody knew that Hoover had done well as President —magnificently at times—but few in the opposition could be found to say so before the votes were counted. Now they can express their real convictions.

The stakes played for in the election were enormous. Not only the Presidency, with its power and prestige, but all the Cabinet officers, all the ambassadorships and some forty thousand lesser jobs were involved. A determined lot of ringsters and bosses, with some fair, fine men and women, were behind Hoover. A more determined lot of ringsters and bosses, with some fair, fine men and women, were behind Roosevelt. The Democrats sensed the fact that the stars in their courses, or shall

we say the jobless in their wanderings, fought with them, and pushed on to victory. The Republicans knew that the cards were stacked against them, and desperately forced the President to make the fight for himself and lost.

It is fortunate for the country that as good a man as Franklin Roosevelt was nominated. The Democrats could have elected practically anybody that they put up. We might have had "Ma Ferguson," or William Randolph, as President! Instead we get a gentleman whose instincts are on the side of decency and clean administration, who showed courage in handling the case of Mayor Walker, and who has done well in every position that he has filled. We have not liked all of his speeches, any more than we liked all of Mr. Hoover's speeches, but the country is fortunate to get him. One thing we must say for him; his comeback after a physical knockout that might have broken his spirit and made a helpless old man of him shows caliber.

People are saying now that probably it is a good thing for us to get the feeling of protest out of our systems in one huge orgy of resentful voting. That is what it amounts to. It is quite likely that the sane, constructive measures started by Mr. Hoover to end the depression will be continued, and the country brought back to a reasonable degree of prosperity.

We want just that. We are utterly unashamed to state it. We want real estate and securities to go up. We want good offers for some of our denominational property. We want an increased subscription list. We want our own salary and the salaries of our associates put where they ought to be. We want a little less worry and considerably more comfort. Some hundred millions in this country and other hundred millions abroad want the same thing, and we want it for them. We are not at all interested in scrapping our social system, but we are interested in making it work, and work with justice to everybody. That these are the days of "last things" and that revolution is impending, to us is sheer nonsense. We want the Administration of Franklin Roosevelt to serve our country and the world, and to bring back prosperity, and if that means that forty millions of fool voters will think the Democrats deserve all the credit we are perfectly willing that they should think so, for the time being at least.

Mr. Roosevelt's first test will come with his Cabinet, and his second will come over foreign affairs. If he gets Young, Newton Baker, Baruch, Smith, Norman Davis, John W. Davis, Frances Perkins and other people of that kind to help him, he will be off to a good start. If he seeks the advice of the only Hiram of California, or the editor who is the chief exponent of selfish nationalism, or some of the big navy group, he will be a beaten man before he takes the oath. We are confident that he wants to do the unselfish, broad-minded thing. His tact, his patience, his friendliness, his gift of making diverse types pull together, his ability to dramatize his acts and carry the people along with him, his real courage, will help him drive the sons of the wild jackass and his own donkeys in one team.

His hardest task will be to change the enormous mass of isolationist sentiment into intelligent patriotism. Most of us do not see yet that we can not collect war debts and have trade too, that we can not pass pork barrel bills and bonus bills and huge armament bills, and reduce government expenses, that we can not let Europe stew in her own juice and be prosperous ourselves. We must learn these things. Probably Franklin Roosevelt, under all the circumstances, can do more than Hoover could have done in the next four years to teach us.

Mr. Hoover congratulated Mr. Roosevelt on the opportunity to serve the country that has come to him, and offered to help in every way in his power. He has set a fine example for us all.—*The Christian Leader.*

The Oxford Centenary

By the Rt. Rev. Rocksborough R. Smith, D.D.
Bishop of Algoma, Canada

Next year, the Anglican communion throughout the world will be celebrating the centenary of the Church revival which is commonly known as the Oxford Movement. This event is one which will be the concern of not merely one party in the Church, but of the whole communion, and the Archbishops of Canterbury and York have appointed a committee, containing men of every school of thought in the Church, to arrange for its celebration.

The movement for the recovery of the full Catholic heritage of the Church of England is usually dated from the great Assize Sermon on National Apostasy preached by John Keble at Oxford in the year 1833. The centenary will be an occasion which should call forth our sincere gratitude to Almighty God for all the blessings which He has bestowed upon our Church during these hundred years.

It is exceedingly difficult for us today to realize the condition of the Church of England at the beginning of the nineteenth century. To many unbiased observers it seemed as if her end was near. There was a great gulf between the relatively few clergy who were well paid and the poor curates who did the work in the parishes, and whose social standing was not far removed from that of the upper servants in a large house. Pluralism was rampant. The anonymous publication in 1831 of a remarkable book called *The Extraordinary Black Book* gave a great shock to everybody. It showed how unequally the revenues of the Church were being distributed. Most bishops received the emoluments of one or more canonries, of several "fat" parishes and perhaps a deanery. It is said that Bishop Watson of Llandaff, who died in 1816, was also professor of Divinity, held sixteen parishes, and only visited his diocese once. A third of the clergy were pluralists and many of them never resided in their parishes but lived where they liked, while miserably paid curates cared for the flocks. The Bishop of Ely (Sparke), his son and son-in-law, between them received £30,000 of Church money.

Churches were closed all the week through, their interiors disfigured by huge and ugly three-decker pulpits, often placed right in front

of the Holy Table; the altars were bare, often covered with dust and cobwebs; the fonts frequently used as receptacles for all kinds of rubbish; the pews of the rich were little rooms with doors, carpeted and often containing fireplaces, enabling the squire to poke the fire noisily when he thought that the sermon had lasted long enough, and the poor sat in the most draughty parts of the church on hard and bare forms, bearing the stigma of being called "free seats."

The Holy Communion was ousted from its proper place as the center of Christian worship and devotion, and was, even in many large city churches, celebrated only three or four times a year. The eucharistic vestments and other accessories of devout worship, although ordered, as now, by the Ornaments Rubric of the Prayer Book, were given up and in many cases sold. In short, it seemed as if the Church of England were on its last legs and could only exist for a short time longer.

We have not even yet, a hundred years after the revival began, recovered all the beauty and dignity of our Prayer Book services which we lost during those days of carelessness, slovenliness, and neglect. But we are slowly recovering them. Ingrained prejudices die hard. The Tractarian leaders, as they were called, were accused of being disloyal to their Mother Church and of wishing to bring about her submission to the Pope of Rome. Yet in reality they were, as is commonly recognized nowadays, loyalists, not rebels; recoverers of what had for a time been lost, not innovators. They based their claims on the Prayer Book, taking its directions precisely as they stood, attempting no subtle evasions, shielding themselves behind no ambiguous phrases. They had at their ordination received authority as priests of the Catholic Church, and they acted on that authority. At last, when it became clear that they were in reality loyal to the principles of the Prayer Book, and that their opponents were unable to answer them, there arose a loud demand that the Prayer Book should be revised because it was too Roman. When at last the demand was granted and the Church of England, after a long period of study and negotiation, revised the Book in 1927, they complained that the revision made it more Roman than ever. Yet this revision was throughout the work of the bishops, priests, and laymen of the Church, and was accepted almost unanimously by the convocations, the Church Assembly, and the majority of the dioceses.

However, the whole Church will thank God next year for all the blessings which He bestowed upon us as He saved the Anglican Church from extinction, and we should show our gratitude to Him for His bounteous mercies by teaching with even greater definiteness, devotion, and fervor the saving truths of the Catholic religion as we have inherited them from the past, and receive more humbly, earnestly, and devoutly the wondrous spiritual blessings which come to us from fervent prayer and meditation and from the frequent reception of the Sacraments of the love of our divine Redeemer.

The Anglican Church sets before her members an extremely high ideal of faith and practice. From her Prayer Book we see that she expects them to be present at the offering of the great Christian Sacri-

fice on every Sunday and Holy Day, to be frequent in receiving Holy Communion, to be diligent in observing the Fast Days which she orders, and to use the vestments and other ornaments of both church and minister which she lays down. But she leaves a great deal to the individual conscience, with the result that some of her members not only neglect these requirements themselves, but actually object to other members, carrying out her plain directions. It is surely time that this narrow-minded attitude passed away and that those who do not themselves observe fully the Fasts, the Festivals, and the Ceremonial of the Prayer Book should, at any rate, respect the consciences of those who try to do so.—*Living Church.*

The Inhabited Ruins

F. C. Hoggarth

A story is told of two American women, wandering round Oxford, the soft limestone of many of whose colleges is badly weathered, and some of which look in a state of decay. These visitors pushed their way up a stair in a back quadrangle and opened a door. They saw a much alive and contemporary looking youth, sprawled in a basket chair, before a cheerful fire, filling the room with pipe smoke and his brains with Aristotle's ethics.

Somewhat nonplussed, the ladies apologized for their intrusion. "We are sorry, but we had no idea that the ruins were inhabited."

That's the story told by Dr. Sperry, which may or may not require an effort to believe. One at least has heard things more difficult to credit. Some there are who seem to make a similar mistake regarding the Church. They regard it as the home of a lost cause. They also might be surprised to discover that the ruins are still inhabited, and by a rather wonderful set of folk.

Doubtless at times they manifest petty faults, and narrow prejudices, and their ways at times have afforded the cynic his opportunity. The squabbles that break out from time to time are a discredit and the occasional lack of charity in judgment disgusts. Discovered inconsistencies in the lives of some who frequent the church have led others to indict the whole Church as a hypocrisy. Critics can be found who have dipped their pens in gall when writing of the churches.

Arnold Bennett knew something of a Methodist chapel in his boyhood days. His parents were Methodists, yet his references are full of scorn. The folk who worshiped and worked in the place, including his parents, were a miserable, narrow-minded lot of Pharisees. Apparently he never saw anything in any one of them that was praiseworthy.

In the "Autobiography of Mark Rutherford" is a picture of the personnel of independent churches that Hale White had known. He had been soured by his experience, and paints a grim picture of their illiberality, their dulness, their imperiousness, their petty malice and much else. Judged by its influence on his spirit, A. J. Gossip calls it the most un-Christian book he has ever read. "Though church people

can be troublesome they have no resemblance to the repulsive reptile house of crawling, stinging, loathsome things!" That is a caricature set down in the bitterness of a man's spirit. Not what Bennett and Rutherford saw, but what they missed, is the most significant things about the Church.

After working in scores of different churches, in village and city, north and south and west, and knowing from the inside all too intimately the things on which critics seize, I should say that the churches house a wonderful fellowship. The story of week by week loyalty, devotion and sacrifice, found in them, never could be told. It is simple nonsense to say that the people outside are as good as those inside. A millionaire's son once told us that though he lived next door to a church, he never went, because he reckoned he was just as good as those who did go. But he wasn't. I could easily have produced scores of simple folk the latchet of whose shoes he wasn't worthy to unloose.

Where would be the great philanthropies and similar but more local charities, but for the churches? Where do their friends and their workers come from? What of the Sunday school movement, Scouts and Guides, Boys' Brigades and the like? Where would they be, apart from workers supplied by the churches? When any bit of social service is to be done, is there more likelihood of response from those outside or those inside churches?

People who don't know might be amazed at the number of appeals that come to churches and their members, and even be more amazed at the aggregate response.

The charities and social services of the land know apparently where to look. If critics occasionally investigated a few such facts, they might find reason at least to moderate their indictment.

What an Opportunity!

Not infrequently when a parish has suffered from an excess of ecclesiasticism its vestry finds itself. It asserts its canonical rights. It tolerates no dictation. It expresses the determination to re-establish normal conditions.

Finding that its clergy have intentionally departed from the traditions, doctrine and discipline of the Protestant Episcopal Church, the Wardens and Vestrymen act. They realize that they are trustees of an established corporation and as well the elected representatives of the congregation whose interests they are bound to safeguard.

In calling a new rector they wisely decide to call a man who is loyal to the letter and the spirit as well as to the worship and teachings of their Church. As officers of the parish it is their bounden duty to protect those in it whom they represent from casual and particularly from flagrant violations of their Church's canons and rubrics.

At present many are thinking of the wonderful opportunity that presents itself to the Vestry of Trinity Church, New York.

This parish has the largest endowment of any of our Protestant Episcopal parishes. And, yet not one of its several units is self-support-

ing nor has been for many years. Not one exercises a truly metropolitan influence disassociated from its great endowment.

Without endowment it is probable that not one of its churches or chapels would continue in service for any extended period of time.

With the exception of St. Agnes' Chapel the whole parish has apparently gone Anglo-Catholic. As it has advanced in this particular it has declined as a spiritual factor in the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of New York.

Trinity has been a bit stiff in churchmanship, but up to and through the rectorship of the Rev. Dr. Morgan Dix its churchmanship was never extreme. When Dr. Dix was rector there existed an effective entente cordiale between Trinity and other important metropolitan parishes,—such as Grace, St. George's, Ascension, Calvary, St. Bartholomew's and St. Thomas'. Dr. Dix was a forceful personality, dignified, executive, and an excellent preacher.

Trinity has broken away from those safe and sane moorings of the Protestant Episcopal Church, which were outstanding features of the rectorship of Dr. Dix.

It amounts to a firm conviction that Dr. Dix would not have permitted the placing of the reserved sacrament and sanctuary lamp in his beloved Trinity. The doctrinal implications of this procedure were foreign to his teachings. He would not have tolerated similar irregular and illegal innovations in St. Paul's Chapel. Also, he would have stopped likewise certain other curious Anglo-Catholic practices and activities on the part of the minor clergy of the parish.

These medieval eccentricities have added tinsel but no glory to this ancient and honorable parish. They seem to be tokens of its decline, its loss of influence.

Its extreme Anglo-Catholicism has isolated it from the other important metropolitan parishes. It has made Trinity's clergy a group apart from those of the regular parishes of the diocese.

Trinity's present momentum and influence is due in a measure to her impressive endowment, permitting her to judiciously scatter honoraria to a chosen few; to the political sagacity of her rather large staff of clerics; to favors expected from certain subsidiaries and to her past traditions.

What an opportunity presents itself to the Vestry!

The steadily decreasing or statically small congregations of the parish are keenly interested; the parishes of the diocese and in fact the whole Church eagerly await the decision of Trinity's vestry.

The right man will have a wonderful opportunity to awaken this somnolent parish. An Anglo-Catholic is not that man. A liberal minded Churchman, an alert personality, a forceful preacher, a regular and positive Protestant Episcopalian can meet and solve the problem. If the Vestry choose a leader for their people who is loyal and true to this Church, to its teachings and practices; a man who forgets the dead letter of ecclesiastical and proclaims the living word, clericalism and sacerdotalism will then fade from Trinity's clerical staff and the parish

will cease to be what it has been recently, a centre of Anglo-Catholic propaganda. Trinity will take on new life, new spiritual power.

Such a blessing may be bestowed upon their parish and upon our Church by Trinity's Vestry. Many hope and pray that this group of splendid laymen may be so guided as they in the near future discharge their bounden duty.—*The Chronicle.*

"Why I Believe in God"

The American Institute of Sacred Literature, Hyde Park, Chicago, has just put out the fifth edition of a two-cent work—"Why I Believe in God," by William Adams Brown. Kirtley Mather appears in this series of two-cent books, or leaflets, Robert Millikan, Pupin, Fosdick, Douglas Macintosh, Professor Conklin, and others. They are really less than two-cent books, for they are sent out by the hundred for $1.50. Think of it! Little bullets of religious fact and feeling going with such a zip to the mark that they penetrate most of the armorplate of prejudice that we are continually building.

Brown is an old-fashioned believer in God, but that does not mean that he is out of touch with God defined as an integrating principle or God defined as simple goodness strictly limited to the heart of man. His God is an integrating principle, but also a self-conscious personality —human, but supra-human also.

"The God whom I worship," says Professor Brown, "is the Christian God, a self-conscious personality, who has a plan for the world and who invites men to cooperate with Him in realizing it. He is known to me in a thousand ways, for He touches my life at every point where I touch reality. But He is known to me most clearly in the character of Jesus Christ, who expresses in human form the qualities of righteousness, love, and wisdom which I believe to be present in God supremely."

This view of God, says Professor Brown, differentiates Him from two rival conceptions which have played a great role: the view that concieves of Him in terms of matter as well as spirit, giving Him a body like that of a man—the view of Mormonism—and the view of the Christian Scientist, which is so mystical that it denies to God the experience of suffering and even denies the existence of pain.

Professor Brown says: "My God is a moral being who shares with me my experience of suffering that He may help me to overcome it."

Professor Brown is a Christian. He claims to revere and worship the Christian God, but he has no hesitancy in declaring that the way in which Orthodox Christianity in the past has described God is inadequate for him.

"I have called this God," he says, "the Christian God. I am well aware that God has often been otherwise described in Christian history. He has been defined in creed and confession as omnipresent, omniscient, omnipotent, immutable, eternal, as Father, Son, and Spirit, three persons in one substance, and more of the same kind. I respect the motives which inspired these statements. I see in the men who made them the desire to express in the language of their day the same aspira-

tion after the highest which I discover in myself, but to me they add little or nothing to what I have already said. They are attempts to say in the technical language of the schools what the faith of multitudes has proved in experience, that in the God whom Jesus Christ has revealed as Father we have the answer to our questions, the satisfaction of our aspirations, the solace of our sorrows, and the inspiration of our highest endeavor. Like enough to us to assure us of His understanding, He is yet far enough above us to command our reverence, and in the union of kinship and transcendence the mystery of His being consists."

Unanswered questions in all this? To be sure. Professor Brown states them and leaves them. He is willing to do his share of puzzling over them, he is glad to have mighty brains busy with them, but he does not in the slightest yield to those who want to rid the world of man's greatest, wisest, tenderest Friend.

In the rest of his space Professor Brown gives his own religious experience, and tells why he believes in God and how his belief has grown through science, biblical criticism, and contemporary philosophy "with its insistence on the relativity of knowledge."

We can not go into this. Suffice it to say that the God of his father, who came through the authority of the Bible, becomes for him the God of human experience. His faith in God and his faith in the man God has made and in the society of God is making stand or fall together.

And he closes with this: "For this faith and what it means for the world I will join hands with every man of good will, no matter how widely in other respects his creed may differ from my own, who believes that good is stronger than evil, love than hate, generosity than greed, hope than despair, in building a world that shall be a fit home for children of such a Father. And I dare to believe that, acting thus, I am acting with as good a scientific conscience as any who in the name of science or philosophy, so called, would constrain me to its alternative."—*E. B. Speight.*

Is This Offered As a Cure for Romaphobia?

Editor The Christian Century:

Sir: In your editorial, "Protestantism Has Not Collapsed," you affirm that the house has not fallen. You ought to know, but by what other name should its condition be know? Is there any agreement—if liberal Christianity be admitted as part of Christianity—as to the existence of deity? (I mean such a personal deity as the one whom Jesus called "Father.") Is there a prevailing belief that Christ was more than a prophet and that he "ever lives"? Is there any general acceptance of his gospel as something more than a merely suggestive and helpful (and tentative) social scheme? Is there a firmly sustained hope that if a man die, he shall live again? I ask these questions because you are in a position to know. I would like to think that there is a general concurrence in the belief that Christ was (and is) more than a somewhat larger Norman Thomas or a magnified social worker.

Turning from Protestantism (uncollapsed) to Catholicism, you would seem to derive some comfort—or at least mental ease—from the distress of the latter in certain lands. You recall losses in Italy, Spain, and Mexico. Italy, however, has restored to the pope enough jurisdiction of a civil sort to safeguard his freedom in functioning as spiritual head of all believers—and that is all he cares for. Mexico and Spain have robbed the church, but a right understanding, for which Christ has prepared us, of the hostility of the "world" towards Christianity, would guard us against expecting justice and fairness from atheists and unbelievers. Catholicism may lose still more in the future, but it will not collapse, nor trim its sails, nor be converted by its enemy to unbelief. Protestants have no cause to cherish the illusion that with Catholicism out of the way, there will be a chance for them and their pure gospel. Atheism does not discriminate; nor does it play favorites.

Have I perceived in times past any Romaphobia on the part of The Christian Century? If I have, then may I say that knowledge would cast out fear. Moreover, should there be a desire to sit in judgment upon the Catholic church, to correct its theology, to fault its claims, and to challenge its organization, Protestantism would de well to consider first the power of the historic church to produce the stuff of which martyrs are made, to form in hosts of souls the image of Christ, to establish in people of all sorts the graces of mystical piety, and to keep the faith—then, and only then, to offer their amendments.

Northampton, Mass. EDMUND BOOTH YOUNG.

The Laymen's Mission Inquiry

EDITOR THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY:

Sir: If your report of the findings of the foreign mission inquiry commission is not so incomplete as to be a misleading one, those findings will certainly constitute a sore disappointment to the rank and file of the supporters of such missions in America. In other words, if the statement you quote with seeming approval which I repeat below, is typical, then there seems little ground for sacrifice and enthusiasm in the cause of missions. You state the commission's position by the following quotation from its report: "The Christian . . . will look forward not to the destruction of these religions, but to their continued coexistence with Christianity, each stimulating the other in growth toward the ultimate goal, unity in the completest truth."

To the ultimate goal proposed, no fair-minded person can object; but the whole tone of your editorial note and the quotations given is to the effect that Christianity and Buddhism, Hinduism, etc., are merely equals in the field of religion, and ought to cooperate and not seek to gain converts from one another. With the fullest willingness to recognize whatever of good there may be in these other so-called world religions, I, for one, have no further interest in foreign missions if I do not claim for Christ the supreme religious leadership and saviorship. I believe and have said, that a better goal than making Hindus, for example, into occidental Christians, would be a Christianized Hinduism,

and so on through the list, Buddhists, Jews, Mohammedans, etc. The kingdom of heaven is like leaven. But that is not the same thing as accepting these faiths in their present forms as religiously equal to the Christian faith. Wherein, if this be true, is the truth of the Christmas angels' song. "Good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people," etc.?

To make the matter concrete and bring it home to the editors of The Christian Century: There are many good people, earnest Christian people, who believe in militarism. Now, let us plan for the future that pacifism and militarism shall exist side by side, and that the pacifists "will look forward, not to the destruction of militarism, but to its continued coexistence with pacifism, each stimulating the other in growth toward the ultimate goal, unity in the completest truth." Are you agreed?

Pasadena, Calif. FRANK C. REID.

Re-Thinking Missions

That they were squaring off at the biggest Protestant question of a century doubtless did not occur at once to the little group of Baptist laymen who met with John D. Rockefeller, Jr., in Manhattan one night in January, 1930. They knew that in Christ's command, "Go ye therefore and teach all nations," lay the largest task of Christianity. Good businessmen, they and Mr. Rockefeller know that gifts to missions had now fallen off alarmingly. People no longer thought missionizing the best way, as they thought it 30 years ago, to spend their charity-money. Most people did not know or care much about conditions in foreign mission fields. Mr. Rockefeller had called his Baptist friends together to hear Dr. John R. Mott, who had just journeyed around the world to look at missions. Out of Dr. Mott's talk grew a plan.

A Baptist committee of five was formed, headed by Engineer Albert Lyon Scott (Lockwood Greene Engineers Inc.). Because the subject seemed too big for five lone Baptists, an invitation was sent to the laymen of the Presbyterian, Congregational, Episcopal, Methodist, Dutch Reformed and United Presbyterian churches. After a preliminary fact-finding study, an Appraisal Commission headed by Engineer Scott and Philosophy Professor William Ernest Hocking of Harvard, set out to tour the Orient for nine months, returned to the U. S. last summer, began releasing its report to the public last month (TIME, Oct. 31).

Last week the complete report was made public, in a volume called *Re-Thinking Missions*,* November choice of the Religious Book Club. Excerpts published in the Press had already caused mutterings. But *Re-Thinking Missions* proved to be well-knit, sincere, lucid, the work of 15 able men and women whose diversities of creeds and interests seemed to preclude collective bias. Thoughtful Protestants had withheld comment until the appearance of the complete report. They now agreed—whether or not they agreed with all the Commission's opinions—that it was a major milestone in the development of church doctrine, church organization both home and abroad. And slowly the realization

* Harpers, $2.

grew that *Re-Thinking Missions* had as much significance for Protestantism at home as for Protestantism abroad. Must not a home-church as well as a mission preach a Way of Life rather than threaten hell-fire? Should not churches unite against atheism and secularism? Is not economy and centralization as necessary at home as abroad?

Summarized thus are the Appraisal Commission's views:

"The mission in some form is a matter not of choice but of obligation. . . . But the essential rightness of the mission idea will not save actual missions from decline or extinction unless in spirit and deed they worthily present that idea.

"The aim of Christian missions [is] to seek with people of other lands a true knowledge and love of God, expressing in life and word what we have learned through Jesus Christ, and endeavoring to give effect to his spirit in the life of the world."

Missions, says the book, must co-operate with non-Christian systems of religion. When missionaries go into teaching, medicine, literature *et al.*, their standards must be higher than those of secular groups. Missionary personnel must be of higher calibre, on the whole, than at present, "even at the risk of curtailing the number of missionaries sent out." There must be concentration of workers in the Orient, with unity among the various Christian sects (which is no new recommendation—unity has long been sought, and achieved in such organizations as the 16-denominational Church of Christ in China). Abroad, responsibility must be transferred from missionaries to natives. At home, all Protestant missionary boards should in the Commissioner's opinion be consolidated in a single administrative unit.

What U. S. Protestant churches would do about the Appraisal Commission's report was not at once apparent. They were not oblidged to do anything, for the Commission specifically disclaimed any intention of asking the various missionary boards to adopt or reject it. First U. S. Protestant body to repudiate it flatly was the American Lutheran Conference, a large Midwestern federation of synods formed in 1930. Last week the Midwestern Lutherans passed a resolution condemning the Commission's statement that Christianity "has become less concerned in any land to save men from eternal punishment than from the danger of losing the supreme good." The resolution announced that the American Lutheran Church would continue to "preach to all the world the gospel of salvation through faith in Jesus Christ alone."

Of the seven churches concerned in the joint inquiry the Methodist Board of Foreign Missions last week led off with a pledge of greater co-operation with the Commission but warily added it did not necessarily "swallow the whole report." It seemed likely that the Baptist and Congregationalist churches would favor the report. If the other four churches balked at the report it would be because of one fundamental difference of opinion. The whole theological problem both for home churches and for foreign missions is: A God-centred or Christ-centred religion? The report emphasizes God and makes no mention

whatever of "Preach Christ and Him Crucified" or "Preach the Blood." This omission more than any other would infuriate fundamentalists.

The Appraisal Commission had its big evening last week, and no one heckled its members as they arose in the ballroom of Manhattan's Hotel Roosevelt to explain *Re-Thinking Missions.* Necks were craned for a look at two outstanding visitors: John D. Rockefeller, Jr., the man who started it all, and Mrs. Pearl Sydenstricker Buck (*The Good Earth*), whose intense, quietly emotional appreciation of *Re-Thinking Missions,* reprinted from this week's *Christian Century* and handed to the guests, called it "a great monument, dividing the dying past from a glorious new movement in Christian life."

There was no discussion of the report from the floor, but guests could write out questions for Commission members to answer. One question hit at a point which had disturbed many a U. S. churchman. Why had the Commission rushed into print from its findings before giving mission boards a chance to peruse the full report? It was replied that the excerpts were publicized (by Ivy Lee) in order to bang them home to the people who needed most to be told, the laymen.

The matters in hand seemed to grow most vivid through the personality of Dr. Hocking, the ruddy-faced, stubbly-mustached 59-year-old Harvard philosopher who chairmanned the Commission. No great orator, he spoke intensely, earnestly. A cool-minded stalker of religion in his books (best-known: *The Meaning of God in Human Experience*), Dr. Hocking wrote the first four chapters of *Re-Thinking Missions,* the groundwork of the whole discussion. Last week he got his laugh when he was asked to answer somebody's question: "If it be accepted that a culture, as distinguished from a mood or a tendency, must be informed by one great unifying conception, can it be said, with any degree of realism, that in our modern world, in which are found fundamentally divergent viewpoints in regard to every basic conception, something exists on a world scale to which can be given the name of culture? If such a culture exists or is emerging, a culture of which, as the report suggests, Christianity should be made the spiritual buttress, what is the basic idea which inspires it?"

"Yes!" cried Dr. Hocking quickly.

He also said: "If there is anything about this report that suggests a jauntiness of criticism, I pray that God will forgive us. The criticisms which we have uttered, we have uttered with groanings of the spirit. . . .

"I think that what we have tried to do is this: we have tried to recognize that the work of God is the work of God, and that it is too holy to be touched and judged by our feeble intellects."—*Time.*

Trinity Rector

The highest ranking official in the Protestant Episcopal Church in the U. S. is the Presiding Bishop—at present Rhode Island's Most Rev. James De Wolf Perry. The ranking diocese, Episcopalians agree, is that of New York, now ruled by Bishop William Thomas Manning. But several individual churches pay their rectors more than they do their bishops. Of these, none is older, none richer than Trinity Church at the top of Wall Street in Manhattan.

Trinity has been looking for a rector to succeed the late, genial, Anglo-Catholic Dr. Caleb Rochford Stetson, who died last June (TIME, June 27). Last October *The Chronicle*, liberal Episcopal monthly, urged the Trinity vestry to pick a liberal churchman rather than a Catholic as it has usually done. Last week, after lengthy consideration, the vestry made known its choice, a broad churchman who is nonetheless Catholic enough to suit Bishop Manning, who immediately confirmed the appointment. He is Rev. Dr. Frederic Sydney Fleming, 46, a slender, six-foot, bespectacled clergyman who began his career as a baker's assistant, became assistant to the president of big National Biscuit Co. before studying for the ministry at Western Theological Seminary and Nashotah House (Anglo-Catholic) in Wisconsin.

Dr. Fleming was ordained in 1911, served as curate in several small western parishes, was rector of Chicago's Church of the Atonement from 1915 to 1927. This post he liked so well that, in 1924, he refused the bishop coadjutorship of Northern Indiana and the bishopric of Olympia, Wash. After holding the rectorship of St. Stephen's in Providence, he became vicar of the Chapel of the Intercession (one of Trinity's offspring) in Manhattan in 1930. Twelfth in a line of rectors dating from 1697, he will get something like $20,000 a year,* considerably more than his superior Bishop Manning (a onetime rector of Trinity) who last year took a 10% cut in his $15,000 pay (TIME, March 14). *Time.*

* Trinity's assets are some $18,000,000, mostly in real estate, the income of which goes to its chapels, to charities and missions, to sister churches (even swank St. Thomas's on Fifth Avenue was glad of Trinity's help when it was getting started).

Book Review

NOTE—*Reviews, when not signed, are by the Editor.*
(When ordering books, please mention this Magazine.)

New Horizons of the Christian Faith by *Fred C. Grant, S.T.D.*, Dean of the Western Theological Seminary, Evanston, Ill. Morehouse Publishing Co., Milwaukee, Wis., 287 pages.

This book came out four years ago but owing to the freshness and timeliness of its contents we do not hesitate to introduce it to our readers now. The author, with so many others, holds that it is necessary for the Christian theologian to come to an understanding with the science of the day. There have been so many changes in the modern outlook on man and the world that old theological views and methods are largely out of place. It is the rational task of theology, he says, to effect a *synthesis* between reason and faith. The theologian is a servant of society. He is influenced by the workers in other fields and he himself is to make his contribution to the well-being of society. To one coming from the study of K. Barth, the difference of viewpoint is evident at once, for Barth contends for a "diastasis" (a falling asunder) of faith and reason, and the Christian, according to him, has no standing in society. The present author is also quite anti-Barthian (althought he mentions Barth only once) in the optimism of his position. Not only does he believe that theology and science do never really contradict each other, but that the time may be almost in the offing when the Christian world will see a sounder growth than in any period of its history.

Modern thought has without a doubt had a bearing upon traditional doctrine. We all feel that unity of thought is indispensable. What is true in science must be true in theology. One cannot be "a pagan with the head and a Christian with the heart" (Jacobi). How, then, can we, in the midst of so many changes bring religion up to date? How can any Christian teaching prove its validity? The answer of Will James was pragmatic. He claimed that the usefulness of a doctrine was an argument for its truth; that it was therefore justifiable not to believe things that were detrimental to human welfare. There is truth in his pragmatic approach to faith, although one ought not to forget that there is a usefulness in "the long run" which does not always coincide with what is useful in the short run. Besides, the pragmatic argument is not the only one.

The first area where the author attempts his "Synthesis" is the wide field of the universe. Modern science has disclosed its vastness and the comparative smallness of our earth as well as of the world view of our fathers. In this universe the reign of natural law is universal. At the same time, there is a constant change of everything. The time may come, say the scientists, when the sun will have burned

itself out and eternal and universal cold will make an end to all life. Even the Scriptures speak of an end of the world. The author thinks that even if such an eventuality should ever take place, it would not affect the world and life of the spirit. Moreover, it is to the credit of religion that it gives order and meaning to human life, some sort of permanence and certitude in this world of change.

If the Bible, in Genesis I and II, gives an account of the origin of the world and man that seems now unscientific, it is to be considered that this story is a poem, that it is not to be taken literally. All that counts and is of enduring value in it is that statement in the beginning that God is the creator of everything. In regard to the miracles, the writer says, they do not happen by force of a higher law; they are not a violation of nature's laws but are due to the immediate action of God. Naturally many miracles will not stand the test of the modern viewpoint. The miracles of healing in the New Testament doubtless were actual facts, while in some cases superstition or ignorance may have exaggerated to marvelous aspects things that could be explained naturally.

"Science," the writer thinks, "is not far from the doctrine of Athanasius, Augustine, etc., that the God who fashioned the world is the same who was incarnated in Jesus Christ." "It is surely legitimate to accept biology's findings and while reading them strictly in accordance with the key supplied by science, at the same time go on to build a view of the world into which they will fit without misrepresentation or suppression."

In the next chapter on "the History of Religion" the writer is inclined to give credence to Otto's famous idea of the *numinous;* that religion owes its origin to the feeling of a mysterium tremendum et fascinosum (especially the latter). On the whole, he says, the nature and value of religion is not affected by its lowly origin. The variety of religious experience does not militate against its validity. Passing over to the Church's missionary activity, he pleads, with the modernists, for an irenic attitude towards other (even pagan) faiths; not to adopt the "true or false" viewpoint, but the attitude of *sharing* with others the fuller light of Christianity.

In regard to "Doctrines in the Twentieth Century" the author distinguishes between primary and secondary teachings. Primary doctrines are those which have to do with God, the Trinity, Christ, his atonement, his incarnation, etc. Secondary doctrines are the teachings about angels, Satan and so forth. Doctrines that have no religious value, that cannot be verified in experience or by the clear testimony of Scripture or the experience of the church; such doctrines may be in our theology, but they are clearly not primary. Remember, man is saved by faith, living faith, not by his theology.

The author, so he tells us, holds the (Anglo-) Catholic position, but of the Liberal wing of that group, not the Romanizers. His views do not in all respects coincide with ours, but the book is a commendable attempt at that synthesis of science and faith that he spoke of in the beginning. His style is eminently clear; it is a pleasure to peruse

his chapters. When we read his initial statement that he was a liberal (Anglo-) Catholic, we were not sure that that recommended him to our ourselves. The program of these "Catholics" is generally the effort "to recover the whole Catholic heritage." This writer may cherish the same desire, but if he does he does it with saner moderation than some other writers whose books issue from the Morehouse Publishing Company.

What We Jews Believe, by *Samuel S. Cohon,* Professor of Jewish Theology, Hebrew Union College (Cincinnati, Ohio.) Dep. of Synagogue and School Extension of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Cincinnati, 1931. 196 pages.

This book while primarily written for the Jewish layman to inform him on the beliefs of the Jews of today, holds much of interest for the general reader.

It contends manfully and intelligently for the place of religion in the modern world. "For good or for evil religion has been the imperious mistress of the hearts and minds of men. No form of culture and no system of science or philosophy, no ideal of ethics or cause of human betterment has called forth the self-sacrificing devotion and the death-defying zeal which religion has evoked in the hearts of men." Religion is not the product of designing priestcraft. Priests are not the originators but only the guardians and conservers of religion. It was born of the inner life of man. In the physical struggle against nature, against warring tribes and the soul's battle with inner dissensions, it has helped man along towards the integration of personality. Born of fear, hope and the sense of the Holy (R. Otto), religion in its full development lifts burdens, emancipates from crushing fears, replaces the moral and mental chaos with light and with order. "As in the dream of Jacob, religion has functioned in the lives of men and of nations as the mystic ladder which links earth with heaven. And it has served also as the Song of Ascents to the accompaniment of which humanity has been rising ever higher on the tortuous road of progress."

While from the standpoint of God and the ideal there can only be one religion, from the standpoint of man there is a variety of religious practice. Outward circumstances, geographic, economic and psychic factors reflect themselves in the religious beliefs and customs of people. A contributing factor to the differentiation of religion is the genius of personal leadership. In the historic religions this latter element has had a decisive influence. This is especially the case with Christianity, Mohammedanism and Buddhism. All historic religions have produced a creed, a rule of conduct, a cult and a congregation. Without such, religion could not have survived in its essential features.

The writer now traces the development of Judaism. The Old Testament contains the story of the first millennium of Jewish history from the call of Abraham and the life work of Moses down to the time of the Sages (Wisdom literature) and the wars of the Maccabees (in the Apocrypha). Israel's religion was national. It was not a church we have before us but the whole people. But while the prophets sought

to train the people in faith in God and obedience to his law, the kings and people had wholly secular ideals. They wanted power and prosperity like the heathen nations around them. The work of the prophets was unsuccessful. In 586 the nation succumbed to the Babylonians. Never, after this, did Israel, for any great length of time, regain national independence. The Romans, in 70 A. D. completed the destruction of the Jewish state and the dispersion of Israel. The synagogue took the place of the temple. The Torah became the fence that kept the people away from heathen influences. This Torah was, according to the writer, not the Pentateuch only, but the whole deposit of divine revelation, including prophets and sages and the later oral law of the Mishnah (rabbinical interpretation) that found its place in the Talmud.

The history of Israel after the destruction of the city was that of sheep fallen among wolves. The author dwells but briefly on the tragic character of the centuries following. Never did people suffer as Israel suffered and never did persecution accomplish less than it did in the insane attempt either to convert them or crush them. These millenniums of martyrdom naturally cramped their spirit. A narrow legalism prevented all progress and emancipation of spirit. No wonder that when the French revolution ushered in political equality and the age of Enlightenment bred tolerance, many Jews eagerly accepted the new privilege. Reform-Judaism was born, rationalism made its entrance in Israel. The author of this book belongs to this school. The miraculous features of the Old Testament are quietly laid aside. Still our writer shows a very warm appreciation of the religious spirit. His position is irenic; he says as long as people are not ready for the new light they must walk in the ways of the fathers. God is found by all true seekers, and religion is more a matter of the heart than of the intellect.

What do Jews believe then as to God, man, the world and the Bible? Very much the same as the Unitarians do: the unity of the Godhead, its transcendence and immanence, moral idealism, the coming kingdom of God, immortality. They seem to hope that the Gentile world will yet accept their teaching: "Our consecration has made us an eternal people with an everlasting message for humanity." "We are not a race but a religion," one can hear individual Jews say at times. This author emphasizes strongly that their religion made the Jews what they are. At the same time, he believes in their racial solidarity. Their blood is Semitic, not Aryan and they can't separate themselves from the history of their race. Their historical experience is the mother soil in which all their characteristic convictions and ideals sprang up and were nurtured.

"Judaism, growing out of Jewish travail and earnest aspiration, contains a saving message for the world today. To humanity 'drifting towards the rapids,' to nations 'racing with catastrophe' and to men sinking into gloom and despair, it proclaims ever anew its eternal affirmations of faith in the divine order of nature and in the sanctity of human life."

Christians will doubtless say that the mission originally given to

Israel has long passed on to Christianity and can, with more hope of success, be carried on by the Christian Church; but we will only report, not criticize.

Ways of Believing, by *Miles H. Krumbine.* Harper and Bros., New York, 1931. 156 pages.

The shares of religion are at the present time below par. Science is on the throne in the modern world and everything that will not yield to the scientific method seems of doubtful importance and questionable validity. The author's book aims to show that nevertheless the objections to religion arise more from our attitudes than from intellectual reasons. He quotes from a preface to the works of Shakespeare: "If you do not like him you are in some manifest danger not to understand him," and goes on to say that our likes and dislikes have a subtle power of directing our thinking and deflecting our investigation toward conclusions that harmonize with the emotional color scheme of our general mental make-up.

Why should faith, intuition be so discounted in religion when the scientist cannot get along without unproved assumption and hypothesis? Science persists in the confidence that reality is approachable. Man feels the need to order his world to make the universe intelligible. He finds it intolerable to abide in a universe that is irrational. We see therefore that in the field of science as well as in that of religion we have need of faith. If today the faith in prayer, in God, in immortality is on the wane in many, according to the writer the reasons are not chiefly intellectual. They are a result of our attitudes. We don't pray for the daily bread because God seems to have little to do with it in our machine-ruled world. The industrial order, made by man, determines how much we are going to get of it, not the climate dependent on the Lord of nature. On the other hand we don't pray for spiritual things because the materialistic character of the time makes us indifferent to them. So with the faith in God and the hereafter. He is not in our heart, therefore not in our minds; and life, to many, in spite of an abundance of things, is futile; so they don't care whether it continues. Nevertheless, although intellectual reasons are not the chief factor in our religious decay, they play quite an important role. Skepticism is characteristic of the modern temper. It would be easy to mention voices that have spoken recently on their loss of religion and have been heard by many. They have not gloried in the fact of their inability to believe; on the contrary, there is a note of sadness, yes even of despair, in their utterances. Still, the whole scheme of the Christian religion, the "Christian epic", from start to finish, they say they can't accept. The "old-time religion" is cast in a miraculous mould. And this is not true only of the fundamentalist kind. Even those who accept the critical view of the Scriptures; even those who believe in evolution, hold fast to a creator-God; they stand by a divine Saviour, they believe in a risen Christ. But to the man of the modern temper Jesus has lost his authority; the spiritual has lost its lure; the church has lost its sense of mission.

Can Christianity win back the affection of the modern-minded? asks the writer. Can it become the "religion of the healthy mind"? he so puts it using a term made popular by W. James. He answers his question by saying, Yes, if it will be morally strenuous; if it takes the scientific spirit to its bosom; if it will be humanly hopeful. And, finally, if it again defines the issues in modern life so that it becomes dangerous to side with religion. "When religion will lay on the soul of modern man a sense of guilt for the social miseries, economic injustices and pitiful fears and hates of international life, a sense of guilt for the sins he did nothing to create, then man will rise to the call of discipleship."

That certainly is the heroic note and is the social gospel heavily underscored. We confess we do not exactly see where to put the writer theologically. Our beliefs, he says, are the temporary definition of our faith. Well, in a way we are agreed on that. Only, we have a habit—traditional, we suppose—to put a man where he belongs. Krumbine was once a Lutheran, but he couldn't walk in the armor of Lutheranism.

The author keeps abreast of all the contemporary literature; he quotes some recent writer on nearly every page. He has a fondness for coining adroit phrases, it would be easy to give a number of examples showing this peculiarity. But it has been his main argument that our beliefs grow out of the way we live; that a belief is a value created out of the need to live; that religion was dependent on analogy as its source of ideas. "Constant processes of adjustment take place between belief and the general culture patterns that prevail. That process of adjustment is not primarily a logical but a psycho-logical operation. In its origin, its intention and its development belief is constantly under the influence of non-intellectual factors chiefly." To this explanation of religious growth from interior sources should doubtless be added the transcendental element of divine revelation.

Life of Phillips Brooks, by *William Lawrence.* 1930. Harper & Bros. Publishers, New York. 151 pages.

In the "Christian Century" of August 10 some one says that he hungers and thirsts for a good biography of Phillips Brooks. The A. V. G. Allan work seems to him to idealize the man. He wants one that shows the depths of the man's character as well as the heights.

Strange that the writer didn't appear to know that a new life of Brooks had been before the public since 1930, this one by W. Lawrence, a new volume in "Creative Lives" edited by Harold E. B. Speight, the editor of the "Christian Leader." It may be doubted whether Mr. Lawrence disclosed any dark "depths" in Brooks' character, but he certainly gives us a very readable book and his hero is a human person throughout and not a "plaster saint."

Phillips Brooks was born in 1835 in Boston, of "good New England ancestry" on both sides. The author goes into his family tree with conscientious fulness, in which he may be pardoned for two reasons, first, because his hero hailed from Boston and second, because it ex-

plains to a certain extent the astounding gifts of personality and talent possessed by Brooks.

His mother was a consecrated Christian, of the evangelical type, believing in conversion, a member of the Episcopal Church. Her son did not pass through such a conversion experience the mother was looking for. At fifteen years of age he entered Harvard College. Four years later, after graduating, he took the position as a teacher of the Latin School of Boston. Having no gift as a disciplinarian he failed ignominiously. Somewhat later, in response to the fervent prayer of his mother and her hope of many years, he decided to study for the ministry. He enrolled in the Alexandria (Va.) Seminary. In 1857 he was confirmed at Boston. Now he dedicated himself whole-heartedly to the service of the Lord.

His first field of activity he had at the Church of the Advent, of Philadelphia. The country was in a turmoil on account of the slavery question. Brooks hated slavery from the bottom of his heart. There were many upholders of slavery in his congregation. But soon the war broke out. Lincoln passed through Philadelphia, Brooks was a great admirer of him. When the great tragedy of Lincoln's death took place he preached a magnificent sermon. He held that Lincoln was a true follower of Jesus Christ. "The whole man," he said, "not his technical faith is the test of the Christian." In 1865 Harvard College arranged for a great Commemoration Day for all those who had fallen in the War. Brooks delivered only a short prayer on this occasion but it was of such a quality that the eyes of the country were on him from that time. "In five years he emerged from his pastoral, prophetic and civic experiences a really great man, great in his judgment, imagination, eloquence, faith."

In 1869 he was elected rector of Trinity Chureh, of Boston, one of the leading Episcopalian churches of the country. Here he ministered for twenty-two years. In 1872 the great Boston fire destroyed Trinity Church. A new Trinity was rebuilt in the centre of the city, the period of relocation and rebuilding lasting four years. From Trinity he was called to be bishop of Massachusetts, serving only eighteen months in this capacity when death intervened, in his fifty-seventh year.

By common consent Phillips Brooks is considered to be the greatest, or second greatest, preacher of the country. Some accord first place to H. W. Beecher. Beecher doubtless surpassed him in dramatic power. Of both it may be said that they felt a new time was coming in the development of Christian thought and they lent their powerful gifts to make the new ideas popular in the church. Beecher put the love of God in the centre of his preaching instead of the Calvinistic divine sovereignty. Brooks believed that the warfare of science and religion should cease and that religion should welcome the truth from any quarter. Christ came not to put our mind in shackles but to make us free. His preaching may be summed up in the Johannine word of Christ: "I came into the world that they might have life and might have it more abundantly." However, if one takes up a volume of

Brooks's sermons with the expectation of seeing him overcome the conflict with science by logical argument, he will be disappointed. Brooks uses analogy, illustration, example, not abstract arguments. Brooks was no theologian, he was a poet, an oratorical genius. His audiences listened to him with rapture, they felt as though they were in a trance while under the spell of his rich imagery, but we venture to say that it would have been difficult for them to repeat much of what he had said. His personality and his manly bearing and gigantic stature must have enhanced the effect of his delivery.

The book is written from the author's memory, supported of course, by the larger work of Dr. Allan. It is a warmhearted appreciation of Brooks's great personality and marvelous genius. We can promise our friends two to three hours of delightful enjoyment from the perusal of it.

Mother and Son or *Love Conquers.* A Cherokee Romance. A Study in Human Values by *Julius Kircher*, D.D. Copyright, 1931, by Julius Kircher. Neat Gift Binding, 50c. Order from Eden Publishing House.

The gifted author, one of the best of our Evangelical Synod poets, takes us into the bright and sunny land of Georgia, "washed by the Savannah's tide." His peculiar love of nature at once takes fire as he pictures for us "the landscape spreading far and wide." Here, "where once reigned the native Cherokee," a romance develops. A white man falls in love with a beautiful Indian girl. A son is born, but soon evil powers conjure up tragedy. The father dies, the mother is driven out. Her son is taken from her, she recaptures her child, flees to Mexico. When the son is a man he takes part in the civil war, on the side of the "Blues". In the closing scene he meets his own white grandfather but proves a better man than the proud southern gentleman. An interesting tale, poetically told with the author's well-known fondness for the romantic and picturesque.

Gospel Dawn in Africa. A Brief History of Protestant Missions in Africa, (illustrated) by *H. Beiderbecke*, formerly Missionary to the Herero, Southwest Africa. The Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, O., 1932. 194 pages, $1.25.

Here is an impartial and interesting presentation of Protestant missionary effort in Africa, giving late statistics, listing the sphere of activity of different church groups and the results of their work. If one desires to inform himself on the work of foreign missions in Africa as a whole, he will find here a convenient handbook, written in popular style, that will seldom disappoint him. Or if the object is to present the work of the missionary as it affected large stretches of the "dark continent", such as East, West or South Africa, the former German colonies, or North Africa, again he can, in a short time, gather enough information to give a satisfactory report to his Missionary or Ladies' Aid Society. The volume as a book of reference on the subject will take its deserved place in the library of the busy pastor. It goes back to the beginnings and in each case ends up with the present status of the work in all the different parts of the vast continent.

Many illustrations and a large missionary map of Africa add to the value of the account. The translation (from the German) is by E. F. Bachmann, pastor of the Mary Drexel Home and J. F. Bornhold, pastor of St. Luke's Evangelical Lutheran Church, New Rochelle, New York.

Das Neue Teſtament Deutſch. Unter Mitwirkung von Hermann Wolfgang Beyer, Friedrich Buechſel, Friedrich Hauck, Gerhard Heinzelmann, Joachim Jeremias, Albrecht Oepke, Heinrich Rendtorff, Julius Schniewind, Hermann Strathmann und Heinz-Dietrich Wendland. **Herausgegeben von Paul Althaus und Johannes Behm.** In 11 kartonierten Einzelbändchen oder drei Ganzleinenbänden 1932 bis 1934. Erſtes Teilbändchen: Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer, überſetzt und erklärt von Paul Althaus. 1932. Verlag von Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, Goettingen.

Weit bekannt und weit verbreitet iſt das ſogenannte **„Goettinger Bibelwerk,"** das in einer Zahl ſtattlicher Bände, mehrfach aufgelegt, eine höchſt-anregende, religiös beſtimmte Auslegung des Neuen Teſtaments für den weiteren Kreis gebildeter Chriſten bietet. In Auswahl ſind auch „die Schriften des Alten Teſtaments" mit derſelben Beſtimmung herausgekommen, ebenfalls in einer Reihe mehrfach aufgelegter Bände. Dieſes „Goettinger Bibelwerk" atmet den Geiſt der (ſogenannten) „religionsgeſchichtlichen Schule." Johannes Weiß war der urſprüngliche Herausgeber der neuteſtamentlichen Reihe; Heitmueller, Greßmann u. a. arbeiteten hier. Seit Karl Barths „Römerbrief" aber hat die Situation ſich grundlegend geändert. Die „hiſtoriſch-kritiſche" Exegeſe wird erſetzt durch eine „pneumatiſche," „theologiſche" Auslegung, die auf „die Sache ſelbſt" drängt. Aus dieſer veränderten Lage heraus beginnt nun ein **„Neues Goettinger Bibelwerk"** zu erſcheinen, das deutlich den neuen Geiſt atmet und das den konſervativeren Aelteren wie den durch Barth und Brunner berührten Jüngeren höchſt willkommen ſein wird.

Dies neue Bibelwerk iſt wiederum für alle Gebildeten geſchrieben, nicht bloß für den Fachmann. Ganz deutlich wird als ſein Ziel angegeben „das Neue Teſtament als das Zeugnis von dem in Chriſtus ergangenen Worte Gottes zu erfaſſen." Dieſe „Sache" die „alle" angeht, bleibt der Leitſtern. Zum Unterſchied von bloß populär-praktiſchen Kommentaren freilich wird hier von Spezialiſten die ſauberſte theologiſche Arbeit geleiſtet und zu Grunde gelegt. Der gegenwärtige Stand der wiſſenſchaftlichen Forſchung wird ſtets berückſichtigt. Aber es ſteht eben nicht mehr die „hiſtoriſch-pſychologiſche" Analyſe im Zentrum. Die geſchichtliche Kritik mit all ihrem mehr oder weniger Intereſſanten und Wichtigen wird wieder die „Magd der Theologie." In einer „Einleitung" wird vieles vorweggenommen, was die eigentliche Auslegung nur belaſten würde. Zum Unterſchied von **Karl Barths** epochemachender Auslegung des „Römerbriefs" iſt dieſe Auslegung nicht bloß „pneumatiſch." Es wird nicht nur noch die „Gleichzeitigkeit" mit Paulus geſehen, ſondern auch die „Ungleichzeitigkeit," nicht nur die Nähe, ſondern auch die Ferne. Das geſchieht aus Gehorſam „gegen die **wahrhafte Geſchichtlichkeit der Offenbarung Gottes.**" Hier ſieht man, wie die als Reaktion notwendige "pneumatiſche" Einſeitigkeit Karl Barths wieder überwunden wird in einer geſünderen Syntheſe, in der eine „hiſtoriſch-kritiſche" Forſchung einer „theologiſchen Beſinnung auf die Sache" dient. Der in

der Autorität des Zeugen Christi redende Apostel ist eben zugleich doch der Judenchrist des ersten Jahrhunderts. Aber in der „Ungleichzeitigkeit" soll zuletzt und vor allem doch die „**Gleichzeitigkeit,**" bei allem Spüren des geschichtlichen Abstandes soll doch eben zumal die Gegenwartsbedeutung der apostolischen Verkündigung zur Geltung kommen; das ewige „Wort Gottes," das uns durch das geschichtliche Menschenzeugnis Pauli hindurch **hier und jetzt** treffen will!

Worauf geht eine besondere **Einleitung.** Sie enthält die Fragen nach Veranlassung, Entstehung, Inhalt, Echtheit und Unversehrtheit usw., dazu eine Charakteristik und Würdigung des Besonderen der betreffenden Schrift im Ganzen des Kanons und ihrer Bedeutung für die christliche Kirche. Der Text ist in Sinnabschnitte zerlegt und neu übersetzt. Die **Uebersetzung** will möglichst wörtlich sein, vor allem aber auch gutes, verständliches Deutsch. Und auf diesem Letzten liegt der Ton. So weit das möglich ist, hält sie sich der lutherschen Uebertragung nahe. Auf die Uebersetzung folgt dann in kleinerem Druck die **Auslegung.** Auch sie hält sich möglichst verständlich, möglichst frei von Fremdwörtern und Fachwörtern. Wichtige Begriffe und Erscheinungen der neutestamentlichen Lebenswelt werden in besonderen **Abschnitten** behandelt. So ergänzt z. B. ein Exkurs über die sittliche Bedeutung des Staates die Auslegung von Römer 13, 1—7.

Daß von dem geplanten dreibändigen Werk zuerst der „**Römerbrief**" erscheint, beleuchtet die Zeit-Wende und die Einstellung der ganzen Veröffentlichung. Deutlich sind auch die Korrekturen von Karl Barths „Römerbrief" spürbar. Und Paul Althaus ist bekannt als modern-konservativer, mächtig ringender und tiefdringender Geist, der sich auch hier beweist. Dieser ersten Teil-Publikation sollen die weiteren in regelmäßigen Abständen folgen, bis 1934 alles heraus ist mit etwa 110 bis 120 Druckbogen. Die Bestellung, d. h. die Vorausbestellung des Gesamtwerkes kann geschehen für monatliche Lieferungen (5 Druckbogen, je 2,10 Reichsmark, die beiden ersten Lieferungen bringen den „Römerbrief"), für elf kartonierte Einzelbändchen (etwa zweimonatlich, umfassen je zwei Lieferungen) oder in drei Ganzleinenbänden (von denen erst Bd. 2, dann Bd. 1. danach Bd. 3 erscheinen wird.) Die Teilbändchen und Ganzleinenbände werden auch einzeln abgegeben, jedoch zu einem 20% höheren Preis als dem für die Subskription auf das ganze Werk. Der Preis ist wirklich niedrig und auch in der „Depression" erschwinglich. Kurz und gut, soweit man auf Grund des Vorliegenden urteilen kann, muß dies „Neue Goettinger Bibelwerk" auf das stärkste empfohlen werden. Dr. Werner Petersmann.

Unfashionable Convictions, by *Bernhard Iddings Bell,* Litt.D. (Professor of Religion in Columbia University, Warden of St. Stephen's College). Harper & Brothers, Publishers, New York & London, 1931. 190 pages.

The author finds that the present world is not in a happy frame of mind. Many people, thirty-five years and over, have unburdened themselves to him and it is his experience that very few men and women of mature years seem to know peace and serenity. The reason is not to be sought in the financial depression. No, he says, we are unhappy because we are unaware of those elements of culture which concern the

inner man. "Reverence for truth, and the pursuit of it for its own sake rather than for what income knowledge may bring; contemplating of beauty and the attempt ourselves to create it for the sheer joy of creation; pursuit of that Reality which men call God, an entrance into mystical communion with Him, and then the seeing of people as bits of the same stuff as Himself—these have always been and still are the ways to happiness."

The author feels that he is at war with a great many contentions of this modernistic age. His belief that the world cannot well get along without the ancient verities is so strong that he finally decided to publish his views in this book. His convictions may seem out of date, unfashionable to many, he says, but he is sure that they are based on the vital needs of man.

His fundamental conviction is that the prevailing worship of science and its methods are exaggerated. Of course he recognizes the great services science has done and is doing the world. But it is going too far to act as though science was the only way to knowledge, or that it could satisfy all the needs of man. He needs God now as he did in the past. The way to find God is the old way of intuition. The author calls it the mystical way and he likes to point to the mystics of past centuries, from Augustine to Dante (?), from Eckhart and Francis of Assisi to Thomas á Kempis and George Herbert as the great pioneers of mystical experience. He evidently takes the term, "mystical" in the wider sense, denoting the ordinary religious experiences of the Christian and not the extraordinary feats of contemplation and absorption of the real "mystics."

We agree, of course, with the writer that the way of faith is the only successful way to God. In describing the "technique" of faith we attach a greater role to the Word while he seems to lift the sacrament to unusual heights.

The author deals with many of the problems of religion in adequate fashion. He seems to think that his position will appear antiquated to many. We rather feel that he maintains his stand very adequately and not at all fanatically.

He discusses a number of the outstanding issues of today, such as nationalism, pacifism, world brotherhood. We always find him in the place of the forward looking idealists. At times he seems to demand too much, so e. g. when in the chapter on "Higher Education and Truth" he wants all the facts even of the laboratory to be seen as reflections of the ultimate. Unless our teaching, he says, is enabling us and our students to apprehend those ultimates, that teaching is a waste of time. One great task the higher schools ought to perform is almost entirely forgotten he contends, they hardly ever even try to teach their students a philosophy of life. A thoughtful, warmhearted, well expressed defence of the Christian attitude in this time of confusion and uncertainty.